FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-011
Tuesday
19 January 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-011 CONTENTS *19 January 1988*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

CW Chief Negotiator Nazarkin Interviewed *[PRAVDA 18 Jan]* 1
Draft Document on ABM Treaty Submitted 2
    Further Report 2
Bogachev on U.S. 'Surplus' Missiles 3
INF Ratification 'Not Simple Process' *[Shishlin]* 3
    'Imbalance' Denied *[Shishlin]* 4
Data 'Destroys' Nonverifiability Argument *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jan]* 4
Arms Curb Progress Since January 1986 Statement *[Kobysh in IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 5
Barker, Palenykh Assess Semipalatinsk Visit 6
Progress After 'Program for Nuclear-Free World' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jan]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev Meets Foundation Leadership 8
    Session Holds News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]* 8
    Gorbachev Addresses Foundation *[PRAVDA 17 Jan]* 9
    Sakharov Speaks to Conference 13
    Sakharov Recounts Gorbachev Meeting 13
Petrovskiy, Others Hold News Conference 14
    News Conference 'Staging Post' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jan]* 16
    Further on News Conference 17
    Participants on Afghan Question *[TANJUG]* 18
    Afghan-Pakistani Talks 18
    Petrovskiy on INF 18
    Plane Downing Raises Questions *[TANJUG]* 19
'International Observers Roundtable' Program *[Zholkver, Kolchanov, Lebedev]* 19
TV Report on Reconciliation Movements 24
Gremitskikh Denies Planes Downed Near Khowst 26
Kashlev on Human Rights Conferences Venues 27
    Comments on Vienna Talks 27

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev Meets Hammer on INF, Afghanistan 29
    Dobrynin Receives Hammer 29
Dobrynin Receives U.S. Visitor Schneier 29
Gromyko Holds Meeting With Senator Biden *[PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 30
Petrovskiy Holds Discussions With Congressmen 31
    Congressmen Meet Tolkunov 31

China

Sitaryan Economic Delegation Visits Shanghai 32
    Delegation Returns 32
Deputy Minister Bavrin Notes Increase in Trade 32
Heilongjiang Broadens Cooperation With USSR 32
Border Firms Begin Trade Talks in Moscow 32
USSR Publishes Collection of Deng Speeches *[PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 33

Northeast Asia

DPRK Denies Complicity in Nov 87 KAL Incident *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]* 34
    ROK on Alert 34
DPRK Declines Invitation to Summer Games *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jan]* 34
Potapov Comments on Takeshita's U.S. Visit 34
Japanese Diplomatic Activities Reported 35
Gorbachev Book Presented at MPR Foreign Ministry 35

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Describes Relations With Indochina 36

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev Sends Reply to PLO's 'Arafat 37
Ambassador to Kuwait on Soviet Gulf Policy *[KUNA]* 37
Najibullah Addresses Reconciliation Commission 38
    Interview on Reconciliation 38
More on Najibullah WASHINGTON POST Interview 39
Tamils' Cease-Fire Call Noted in Indian Circles *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 39

Sub-Saharan Africa

Telegrams Describe Nature of Ghanaian Relations *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]* 40
African Information Ministers Meet in Ethiopia 40

East Europe

Bulgaria To Attend Seoul Olympics *[SOVETSKIY SPORT 6 Jan]* 40
Loginov, Poland's Olechowski Hold Consultations 41
CPCZ Presidium Approves Jakes Visit Results 41
Correction to Central Committee GDR Visit 41

West Europe

Shevardnadze Pays Visit to West Germany 41
    Moscow Send-Off 41
    Officials' Previsit Remarks 41
    Statement on Arrival 41
    Talks Held, Speeches Given *[PRAVDA 19 Jan]* 42
    Genscher Talks 'Constructive' 46
    Genscher Talks End 46
    Holds Talks With Strauss 47
    Meets With Economics Minister 47
    Meets With Businessmen 48
Further on Ryzhkov's Official Visit to Norway 49
    Departs Sweden for Norway 49
    Met by Brundtland 49
    Visits Oslo Monuments 49
    Visits Norwegian Parliament 49
    Accords Signed 49
    Embassy Reception Held 49
    Dinner Speeches Given *[PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 50
    Departs Oslo, Arrives in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jan]* 53
Bruntland Cables Ryzhkov En Route to PRC 54
Current Norwegian Concerns Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jan]* 54

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Zaykov Speaks on Moscow's Development *[PRAVDA 10 Jan]* 55
Samarkand Obkom Plenum Reported *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 12 Jan]* 56
Speaker's Attack on Demirchyan Supported *[PRAVDA 18 Jan]* 58
Foreign Trade Ministry, Committee Abolished 62
  Minister Retained 62
TU-154 Crashes on Approach to Airport; 11 Dead 62
  Turkmen Official Comments 63
  'Too Many' Aviation Incidents *[PRAVDA 19 Jan]* 63
Area Affected by Chernobyl 'Safe' for People 63
Railways Ministry Sets up Safety Directorate 63
Program Spotlights Drug Problem in Georgia 64
Two-Candidate Election Seen Breaking New Ground *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]* 64
Legislation Facing Supreme Soviet Outlined *[Prokhorov]* 65
Moscow Residents Polled on Restructuring 66
Leaders Attend Opening of Artists' Congress 66
  Undercurrent of Dissent Noted *[AFP]* 66
Professor Explains Foreign Books' Censorship *[Zasurskiy in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Jan]* 67
Reader Letters Support 'Remembrance' Holiday *[PRAVDA 11 Jan]* 69
Briefs 70
  New Ethnic Newspapers 70

Economic

New Foreign Trade Bank Begins Activities 70
Foreign Investment Protection Analyzed 70

Agricultural

Ligachev on Preparation for Spring Harvest *[PRAVDA 17 Jan]* 71
Media Report 9-15 Jan Agricultural Developments 72

Scientific

Six 'Cosmos' Satellites Launched 15 Jan 72
Work on Board 'Mir' Space Station 72
  Cosmonauts Continue Experiments 73

CW Chief Negotiator Nazarkin Interviewed

PM181325 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 88 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with Yu.K. Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva chemical weapons talks, by own correspondent A. Serbin under the rubric "Our Interviews": "Ridding the World of Chemical Weapons"—date and place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] A new round of talks on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons has started in Geneva. It will be held at a time when a wind of change is blowing through international relations after the Soviet-U.S. meeting and when hopes of strengthening peace are growing stronger. A PRAVDA correspondent talked to Yu.K. Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation at the talks.

[Serbin] The previous round of talks on chemical weapons, which ended in December, was seen—particularly by the Western press—as fruitful. The USSR had previously expressed the hope that a convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons could have been concluded last year. This did not happen, however. What stopped it?

[Nazarkin] The main obstacle at the talks was and continues to be the stance of the United States—a stance that has remained virtually unchanged since 1984. The U.S. draft convention on chemical weapons which was put forward at the time by U.S. Vice President G. Bush contains provisions which did not and do not promote success at the talks. First and foremost, this applies to the compulsory "inspection on demand" [proverka po zaprosu] envisaged by the convention which is being elaborated if suspicions of violations arise. The U.S. position envisages two procedures for such inspections [proverka], and under one of these procedures private enterprises are entitled to refuse them. Naturally, under this system countries where state ownership of the means of production exists would be discriminated against. We pointed this out in 1984 and continue to do so. But this is just one example. The main overall obstacle is that the United States is unwilling to take into account and consider proposals put forward by the other participants in the talks, including the Soviet Union. Over the last year the talks proceeded in the following way: The texts of articles of the future convention were drawn up with almost all delegations actively participating, with the exception of the U.S. delegation. As soon as a possibility of progress appeared, the Americans stated that they had no instructions and could not obtain them from Washington. The Soviet Union was indeed ready last year to conclude a convention on the complete prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. This did not come about because similar readiness was not displayed by the United States.

[Serbin] The last round of talks was hardly over when the United States stated that it was beginning production of binary chemical weapons. How might this affect the talks?

[Nazarkin] Yes, the present talks are starting while production of binary weapons in the United States has become a fact. The binary program, as is quite obvious, is a step toward a new spiral in the chemical arms race. It is an essentially militarist act undertaken despite the fact that considerable progress has been achieved at the Geneva talks. I would even say that the starting up of production of these weapons is an attempt to torpedo the chemical disarmament process and the Geneva talks. The Soviet Union unconditionally condemns this U.S. action.

[Serbin] In light of this what will our country's stance be at the current stage of talks?

[Nazarkin] The Soviet delegation has left for Geneva with firm instructions to continue to do everything in its power to prevent the talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons breaking down—something that the United States is provoking though its actions.

[Serbin] Our country has stopped allocating funds for the production of chemical weapons. Yet the military budgets of certain Western countries retain appropriations for their manufacture. How is such a situation to be described?

[Nazarkin] The Soviet Union stated that it was ending production of these weapons last April. We took this step in the light of the progress made at the Geneva talks. Needless to say, the fact that certain states, first and foremost the United States, are allocating funds for the production of these weapons cannot fail to worry us. I must state unequivocally that the convention currently being drawn up in Geneva must unconditionally ban all kinds of chemical weapons—those that currently exist, those that may emerge in the future, and, of course, binary weapons.

A natural question is: If appropriations are made for the manufacture of chemical weapons, how sincere is the desire of these states to conclude a convention banning their production? The United States is starting to create stockpiles of binary weapons, thereby demonstrating its disdain for the participants in the multilateral talks which it itself is attending, and displaying its insincerity with regard to the aim of the talks, which is to eliminate the chemical threat to mankind forever. What is the point of having talks in that case?

It may seem blunt to put the question in this way, but, I admit, it may come to that. In this regard I could say the following: The conclusion of any agreement in the sphere of limiting and banning any type of weapon is a long and complex process. It in turn influences the approach of the participants in the talks, including those who may adopt an unconstructive stance. And I think that further progress in Geneva should show those in the United States who currently back the binary program just how senseless it is. As soon as all chemical weapons, including binary weapons, are destroyed, the funds allocated for their creation will have been utterly wasted.

[Serbin] What, in your opinion, is the significance of confidence-building measures for banning and eliminating chemical weapons?

[Nazarkin] Last year the Soviet Union invited the participants in the Geneva talks to visit a military chemical installation at Shikhany. In opening the gates of this installation, we demonstrated our readiness to put a stop to chemical weapons. It should also be said that a group of Soviet representatives, including myself, visited a U.S. military chemical installation at Tooele, Utah. As a result of the strengthening of confidence an atmosphere is being created which promotes movement ahead at the talks.

However, once again I cannot fail to return here to the production of binary weapons in the United States. This step is aimed not just against the talks but also the nascent process of strengthening confidence around them. Incidentally, in order to justify beginning production of these weapons in the eyes of the public, the United States for a long time spread rumors about fantastic chemical weapons stockpiles in the Soviet Union. Enormous figures were cited—from 250 to 700,000 tonnes of combat toxins allegedly held in Soviet arsenals. Quite recently the Soviet Union announced that its chemical weapons stockpiles do not exceed 50,000 tonnes of toxins. This was done to put a stop to the deception disseminated by the United States and certain of its allies on this point. Furthermore, the publication of the real figure was a major confidence-building measure. I must state that hitherto the Soviet Union is the only country to have announced the size of its chemical weapons stockpiles. No other state, including the United States, has done this.

[Serbin] How do we approach the task of strengthening the procedure for ensuring the nonproliferation of chemical weapons in the world?

[Nazarkin] The convention currently being elaborated in Geneva also envisages a ban on the transfer of chemical weapons or technology or means that could help to start up CW production. But we advocate that the proliferation of chemical weapons be stopped right now, before the conclusion of the convention. From time to time the foreign press publishes reports on the proliferation of chemical weapons. These cannot fail to cause us disquiet. Such actions, if they are taking place, do not accord with the goal of ridding mankind of the chemical threat and may complicate the cause of drawing up a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. We condemn the transfer of such weapons, not to mention their use, whoever may be involved. The Soviet Union calls on other countries to show responsibility and restraint, not to transfer chemical weapons, and to end production of them. Nonetheless, the most radical means of preventing the spread of chemical weapons around the world is the speedy conclusion of a convention on their complete prohibition and destruction.

[Serbin] What do you expect to come out of the round of talks that has just started? Could this be the last round before the conclusion of a convention on banning and destroying chemical weapons?

[Nazarkin] As far our viewpoint is concerned, the USSR is prepared to conclude a convention in order to allow the UN General Assembly Third Special Session on Disarmament (it will meet at the end of May) to examine the draft and open this document for signature. But will this actually happen? This depends not just on us but on the other participants in the talks, above all the United States. If good sense prevails in Washington, if new political thinking is shown, and if the U.S. position at the talks changes for the better, the convention could be concluded quite soon.

Draft Document on ABM Treaty Submitted

LD151558 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Geneva January 15 TASS—The delegation from the USSR to resumed Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms today submitted a draft document for observing the ABM Treaty and not withdrawing from it for a specified period.

Delegation leader Aleksey Obukhov told a news conference later that drastic cuts in strategic offensive arms were only possible in the context of preserving and complying with the ABM Treaty, which made it a matter of priority for the Geneva negotiations to deal with related issues.

Ambassador Obukhov stressed that the new document was fully based on the Soviet-U.S. joint summit statement and that the USSR counted on a positive U.S. response to its proposal.

Further Report

LD151827 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Geneva January 15 TASS—The delegations to Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms today held a plenary meeting and the Soviet side there tabled a draft protocol to a treaty between the USSR and the United States on the reduction and limitation of their strategic offensive arms.

The Soviet document is wholly based on the provisions of the joint Soviet-American statement at summit level, which concern compliance with the ABM Treaty and non-withdrawal from it for a specified period.

The Soviet draft commits the sides to refrain from using the right of quitting the treaty for ten years and reiterate their obligation to abide by the ABM Treaty as signed in 1972.

Bogachev on U.S. 'Surplus' Missiles

LD151525 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1420 GMT 15 Jan 88

[By TASS Observer on Military Affairs Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jan (TASS)—Strange things are happening in the United States. After the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles was signed and a memorandum with initial data for U.S. military depots and U.S. bases abroad was published, it turns out that there are some weapons that have not been counted; to be more exact, there are some intermediate- and shorter-range missiles which Washington failed to declare at the talks. A Pentagon spokesman, who was asked how it could happen that the U.S. higher military leadership declared a considerably lower number of missiles subject to elimination according to the treaty, answered that what they had failed to declare is inconsequential—"peanuts," as he put it. The very same spokesman has acknowledged however, that the President himself will have to be engaged in sorting out these "peanuts" and amending official documents to the treaty.

Reports have appeared in the press that the Pentagon has long been deceiving the West German public regarding the number of U.S. cruise missiles in the FRG. It has come to light that after the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles has been signed, the Americans are removing the surplus Pershings under the cover of night from their base in Mutlangen.

Of course, nuclear missiles are not mushrooms that are to be found, or not found, in the forest. One can only guess at the reasons for their concealment, and then their "discovery" by the U.S. side. Most likely it is connected to the more sober assessment in the Pentagon of the potential of the verification measures envisaged by the treaty.

The events with the U.S. missiles are taking place against a background of a loud campaign in the United States over the "discrepancies" between photographs of the Operational-Tactical Missiles-23 (SS-23) presented by the Soviet Union and data on the length of this missile held at the Pentagon. The fact of the matter is that there is no definite rule on whether the adaptor section [perekhodnyy otsek] is part of the missile or the warhead. The propaganda fuss in the United States goes on, despite the exhaustive explanations of the Soviet side on this matter. Moreover, Max Kampelman, he head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, has even said that the United States "does not believe" the Soviet Union. Kampelman, incidentally, did not deem it possible here to explain the reasons for the delay in the presentation of data on the sites for the elimination of the U.S. missiles and launchers as envisaged by the INF Treaty.

The fuss over the length of the Soviet missile is not worth a fig. The aim of it is obvious—to artificially maintain an atmosphere of suspicion in relations between the two countries, to justify in the eyes of U.S. public opinion the unconstructive position of Washington in certain fields of arms control, first and foremost on the problem of the non-militarisation of space.

However, there is another, really important aspect, in this whole story. The manipulation of the declared number of U.S. missiles and the refusal of the U.S. side to observe agreed procedures in presenting data on fulfillment of the treaty are in no way promoting the strengthening of trust in the United States as a partner in talks.

INF Ratification 'Not Simple Process'

LD172050 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Jan 88

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Good evening, Comrades. The first weeks of 1988 have set a record in political eventfulness. Since the memorable Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington, there has been no pause in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. On the contrary, the dialogue is intensifying. Soviet and U.S. experts are now at work in Semipalatinsk Oblast and in Nevada, checking the measuring instruments at the respective nuclear test sites. Another notable fact is that very soon the ratification process regarding the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will begin in the U.S. Senate. Well, it looks as if that process will not go smoothly; but on a sober assessment of the political mood in the United States today, as well as outside the United States, and of the attitudes of the U.S. allies, it is, on the whole, to be expected that the ratification will take place.

The process of ratification is beginning here in the Soviet Union, too. This also not a simple process. It involves many stages—especially since every position and every provision of that crucial treaty will be examined literally under the microscope. Well, you'll realize that I'm talking about the political microscope.

The Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva have resumed this January, and the task facing the negotiators is difficult and complex in the extreme: in a very limited time, to draw up a treaty on a 50% reduction of strategic offensive armaments, with continued observance of the ABM Treaty which was signed in 1972 and which has not been renounced during the agreed period. Time is short, since the U.S. President's visit to Moscow is scheduled to take place in the first half of the year. And if the Moscow result is to be a breakthrough in qualitatively new Soviet-U.S. relations, enormous efforts will have to be made, of course. Above all, there will have to be progress in giving material shape to the program for a nuclear-free world that was put forward 2 years ago, in January 1986, in the statement by Mikahil Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

That is why the sides have agreed that the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state will meet regularly each month, beginning in February—though obviously all this work is not only the fruit of the labor of the politicians of the Soviet Union and the United States, and of the minds of the leaders of the two great powers. In essence, it is the common task of the whole world community and, of course, of the broad international public. And great importance attaches, I think, to the recent meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the leaders of the Fund for Human Survival and Development--and international fund, though I dare say one could give it the simpler name of Fund for the Unification of Mankind.

I think we're justified in saying, at the present time, that international tension—the growth of international tension—has been halted. More than that, it has begun to decline. But a great deal still remains to be done, and many difficulties to be overcome, before we can say with confidence that distrust, hostility, and alienation are giving way to trust and harmony.

'Imbalance' Denied

LD172057 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Jan 88

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] The subject of compensation occupies a fairly prominent place in the arguments of the West Europeans, and not of them alone. It has simply become fashionable. Well, compensation, as has already been explained to us, has to do with the fact that intermediate- and shorter-range missiles are being eliminated. And it is the elimination of these missiles that has to be compensated for. To put it more simply, NATO wants to upgrade its weapons.

Well, I hope this is being put forward at the level of concepts, and not at the level of practical affairs; but it does look as if there were practical plans of some sort behind this, and so let us look at it in a little more detail. They say there is an imbalance in armed forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. I think it is incorrect to speak of an imbalance. A certain balance does exist, but what also exists is an assymetry of armed forces. We have, say, more tanks on our side, more artillery guns; on the NATO side there are more tactical aircraft and more antitank weapons. But that is not an imbalance. The main point is that the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries long ago put forward an idea for abolishing that assymetry, on its lower edge. That is, whatever we have more of, we eliminate; whatever NATO has more of, NATO eliminates.

It is a perfectly clear and simple principle. But it is somehow not to the liking of our opponents; and in any case, for many long months discussion has been going on about how these talks should be designed, what form they should take, who should take part in them, and so on. In other words, there is all this protracted hesitation, which simply puts one on one's guard. The more so since those who advocate compensation seem to be ready to view the compensation program as such on a worldwide level.

In any case, you will have noticed, no doubt, that when the Japanese Prime Minister—new Prime Minister Takeshita—arrived in the United States early in January, he appeared in Washington with increased Japanese military expenditure as a New Year present— which is much appreciated by the present U.S. Administration.

I think if there is some sense in the talk of compensation, then it is quite the opposite of the arguments that are being offered by the authors of those views. I think the talk of compensation simply serves as a kind of bell which they are ringing to remind us that it is time to concern ourselves with conventional arms: time to even out conventional arms, time to reduce them, and to reduce them steeply, guided by the principle of rational adequacy. And this, of course, occupies a place of priority in the European policy of the Soviet Union, just as it does in the policy of our European friends. And, no less purposefully, the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact are striving to develop mutually useful cooperation with their bourgeois neighbors in Europe.

There are, no doubt, many proofs of this, and the freshest is the visit by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to Sweden and Norway. And the possibilities of cooperation—if explored in a practical and concrete way—in Europe, between the socialist and the capitalist parts of Europe, are quite simply unlimited.

Data 'Destroys' Nonverifiability Argument

PM191047 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent A. Shalnev dispatch: "The United States: The Pentagon's Ultrasecret Program. Scientists Have Obtained Data About It on the Basis of Seismographic Information"]

[Text] New York—It has become known here that in the last 25 years the United States has conducted 117 underground nuclear tests about which not a single word has been said officially.

The very first of these tests was carried out literally a few weeks after the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in three environments was signed in the summer of 1963. A group of scientists have managed to obtain data about the Pentagon and Energy Department's—the communal owners of nuclear testing grounds—ultrasecret program as a result of analyzing seismographic information.

The analysis enabled them to detect extremely low-yield explosions—10-12 tonnes.

At the same time, scientists involved in the public research organization the National Resources Defense Council suspect that the scale of the program of undeclared tests was considerably more extensive than they have as yet been able to determine.

The information obtained by U.S. scientists is important for a whole range of reasons. First it is important because it destroys one of the key arguments used by the Washington administration for its refusal to embark on a total ban of nuclear explosions: As the White House sees it, the observance of such a ban is not effectively verifiable since they say that there are no means capable of detecting low-yield explosions or of distinguishing these explosions from, presumably, earthquakes.

From the viewpoint of Congressman Edward Markey, a Democrat from Massachusetts, the report presented by the National Resources Defense Council will promote changes in sentiments on Capitol Hill in favor of a total ban. It is well-known that in the last 2 years the House of Representatives has adopted resolutions three times demanding a ban on all tests with a yield greater than 1 kiloton. Each of the resolutions was ultimately abrogated under pressure from the administration, which argued that a ban is "impractical and unreasonable."

Arms Curb Progress Since January 1986 Statement

PM151503 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own Political Observer Vitaliy Kobysh article: "Two Years Later"]

[Text] Events on an enormous scale have taken place in international life over the last 2 years.

In February 1986 the 27th CPSU Congress proposed to the world community the concept of creating a comprehensive international security system.

In October of the same year a meeting was held in Reykjavik between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President, and this prepared the way for a breakthrough on disarmament.

The Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

Finally, last December in Washington the USSR and the United States signed the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which eliminates two classes of nuclear weapon at the same time. An accord was also confirmed on talks on 50% cuts in strategic offensive weapons, which will be the main issue during Ronald Reagan's visit to the Soviet Union in the first half of this year.

This list of very important international actions for the strengthening of peace and the peoples' security could be continued. They all show that there has been a substantive constructive turnaround on this important matter. Serious observers have no doubt that these actions were determined and placed on a realistic footing by the Soviet proposals announced 15 January 1986 for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons on earth before the end of this century and for the creation of a nonnuclear, safe world.

These proposals were not only far-reaching but thoroughly considered and reinforced by specific practical measures. They came as a complete surprise to some people. On the whole the Soviet program for a nuclear-free world stirred in people the hope that mankind could survive and that the confrontation between both the two systems and between individual states could now be overcome, the way cleared to the ending of the nuclear and other arms races and the prevention of the placing of weapons in space, and trust and peaceful cooperation strengthened between the peoples.

However, there were also those who claimed that the Soviet plan is nothing short of utopian and built on insubstantial illusions. It was pointless arguing with them, their conclusions could only be contrasted with deeds and results.

The Soviet Union has campaigned for the phased fulfillment of the provisions set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 Statement. The effectiveness of this activity combined with the restructuring under way in the Soviet Union and the introduction of democratization and glasnost is demonstrated, in particular, by an article in the journal FOREIGN POLICY, which is influential among U.S. ruling and intellectual circles. In its fall 1987 issue the journal wrote: "Western leaders must recognize the growing threat that they will lose the support of their own citizens if they are unable to be as bold as the Russians." It went on to say: "...The United States must start thinking the hitherto politically, economically, and militarily unthinkable... The time has now come to be bold—in thought undoubtedly, but perhaps sometimes even in action."

Were U.S. leaders "bold", for instance, in signing the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Nuclear Missiles? I do not know how far we can speak of their boldness, but in this case I think they displayed common sense and a desire to jointly solve the problems threatening our peoples and all mankind.

Needless to say, we see this treaty purely as the start of extensive cooperation—in which other countries will also participate—in completely eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons and bringing about considerable sharp reductions in all other types of weapons. [v dele polnoy likvidatsii yadernogo i khimicheskogo oruzhiya i znachitelnogo, rezkogo sokrashcheniya vsekh drugikh yego raznovidnostey]

The agreement on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles—itself unprecedented—goes far beyond the bounds of just this problem. It, so to speak, opened the door to further accords of this kind. This door was "opened" to a considerable extent thanks to the painstakingly scrupulous verification mechanism worked out during the drafting of the treaty.

Verification is a special topic. Long before the direct work on the treaty and its signing, it became clear that the Washington "negotiators" were simply bluffing on this point. Yes, there was a failure to expose this ploy in good time and unmask those who were accusing the Soviet Union of "unwillingness" to agree to verification and using it as a pretext to block the entire disarmament process.

As a result something strange happened with verification. When we accepted everything that Washington had been proposing and in turn came up with an initiative for more far-reaching verification measures the U.S. side clearly panicked, rejecting our proposals point blank. However absurd this may seem, the opponents of the treaty in Congress, as has been reported, intend to use the question of verification to accuse the Soviet Union of allegedly failing to observe the terms. This could almost be funny but, to tell the truth, it is no laughing matter. The opponents of the treaty in the United States are consolidating their forces and by no means all Americans realize that the Soviet Union and the United States are approximately equal on this question and the stringent security measures were adopted precisely to prevent any avoidance of what the two leaders had signed.

As we can see, it is too soon to be complacent. But clearly the ideas put forward on 15 January 1986 are making headway. The new thinking, without which mankind cannot survive in our era, is also gathering strength. In other words, the world is changing before our very eyes. And although there has not yet been a decisive breakthrough in international affairs, the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles—a result of our program for a nonnuclear world—shows that mankind has finally managed to take the first steps in the right direction.

Barker, Palenykh Assess Semipalatinsk Visit

LD151818 Moscow TASS in English 1753 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—The Soviet side has coped with its job excellently during the first visit by a group of U.S. specialists to the Soviet nuclear testing range in the area of Semipalatinsk, the group leader, Ambassador Robert Barker, told a news conference here today.

Barker, who leads the U.S. delegation to Soviet-American full-scale talks for limiting and eventually stopping nuclear testing, said in replies to reporters' questions that Soviet colleagues had provided the U.S. experts with full reports and all essential information.

He said the Americans were going to supply just as detailed data when their Soviet colleagues visited the American nuclear test site in Nevada later this month.

Barker added their joint work was a good model for working out future accords on test limits. He said a complete ban on nuclear testing was feasible, but a lot of hard work would have to be handled first.

The leader of the Soviet delegation to the bilateral talks for limiting and eventually stopping nuclear testing, Igor Palenykh, said, as he answered newsmen's questions, that the joint work with the Americans would be significant also to hammering out further possible arms control agreements.

"This has been a first step and we intend to go further along this path," he continued.

"The next step, as we hope, should be limiting nuclear testing in terms of numbers and yields. Our ultimate aim is a complete termination and prohibition of all nuclear testing," Palenykh said.

"Any arms control measure offers a possibility to broaden cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy," he stressed, adding that verification for the Soviet Union was not an obstacle to reaching mutually acceptable understandings.

"We believe that the ultimate objective will be reached and we shall be working towards it," Palenykh said.

Progress After 'Program for Nuclear-Free World'

PM151047 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jan 88 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Program for a Nuclear-Free World"]

[Text] The establishment of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO was a historic achievement for socialism. It strengthened the positions of the USSR, the socialist countries, and all progressive forces and overturned aggressive imperialist circles' calculations of victory in a nuclear world war. The preservation of this equilibrium is a serious factor in ensuring peace and international security.

However, military-strategic parity in itself still does not guarantee the full security of any country or rule out the potential danger of war. The Warsaw Pact states proceed from the premise that the contemporary balance of military forces is inadmissibly high. And this harbors a tremendous threat to peace. It is obvious that the further continuation of the arms race will still further increase the danger and could bring it to the point where even military-strategic parity will cease to be a deterrent factor. Genuine equal security in our age is guaranteed not by a high level but by the lowest possible level of strategic balance, from which nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons must be totally excluded. Precisely this is the aim of the program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the 20th century that was advanced in the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's Statement of 15 January 1986.

We can no longer tolerate a situation where the danger of nuclear catastrophe hangs over people's heads like a Damoclean sword. Mankind's conscience and the natural sense of self-preservation demand that it be ended. In a world of nuclear weapons any attempt to use them to resolve particular problems would mean suicide.

This is the initial premise on which the program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the present millennium, advanced by the Soviet Union 2 years ago, is based. The energy of the atom must serve only peace—the Land of the Soviets invariably advocated this and does so now. It was the USSR which was the first, back in 1946, to raise the question of banning the production and use of atomic weapons and to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and the good of mankind.

The Soviet program for freeing the planet from the threat of nuclear death is not just another loud slogan far removed from a realistic policy. It clearly designates the goals, the specific approaches to resolving tasks, and the balance of interests. The Soviet concept advanced 2 years ago of creating a nuclear-free, secure world is working and having a substantial influence on international life. The new political thinking, on which the proposal advanced by the Soviet Union for entering the third millennium without nuclear weapons is based, is making headway—with difficulty and a struggle, overcoming established stereotypes and old approaches—but it is making headway. The situation and the mood in the world are changing for the better. "A real process of improving and normalizing the international situation has begun," M.S. Gorbachev has pointed out. "There has not yet been a breakthrough, but one has been initiated by the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles."

The signing of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was an important point in international development. It is a historic treaty, since for the first time it concerns the real destruction of two classes of Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms. The very strict verification measures provided for in the treaty reliably ensure the monitoring of its fulfillment by both sides. The Soviet-U.S. treaty accords with the interests of all peoples.

The Soviet leadership is working persistently toward achieving palpable results in the sphere of a deep cut in strategic offensive arms under conditions of strict observance of the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems, which is of fundamental significance for maintaining strategic stability. The chief idea, the chief purport of Soviet foreign policy is to continue the process of nuclear disarmament. Guided by the new political thinking, the Soviet Union will do everything to continue moving from the nuclear impasse toward general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet program for ridding the world of nuclear weapons capable of destroying all living things on earth is founded not on empty dreams and illusions. A nuclear-free world can and must be created. The Soviet Union not only proclaims this but also translates it into the practice of specific deeds and initiatives. This applies both to halving the strategic offensive arms of the United States and the USSR and to eliminating chemical weapons and reducing conventional arms and armed forces.

In order to go all the way to a radical improvement in the international situation, we will still have to overcome considerable barriers of prejudice. Influential political circles in the West are still cultivating mistrust for the socialist countries' aims and intentions. They even try to portray the Washington missile treaty as the result of Moscow's "perfidious" policy aimed, they say, at weakening the Western alliance. A ballyhoo is being raised over the need for some sort of "compensation."

The socialist countries are giving a worthy reply to the attempts to depict the Warsaw Pact as a source of danger to the West. Together with the Soviet Union they are waging a persistent struggle for peace and the peoples' security. The UN General Assembly's adoption, on the socialist countries' initiative, of a decision in favor of creating an all-embracing system of peace and security opens up new potential for progress in this direction on the basis of finding a balance of UN member states' interests and developing relations of trust and cooperation among them.

The struggle of the USSR and the other fraternal socialist states for peace and disarmament is not a sign of weakness. The allied socialist countries have sufficient potential and determination to prevent anyone from talking with them in the language of force. The defensive nature of the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine, when counteractions are the armed forces' chief modus operandi, does not reduce but, on the contrary, makes still higher demands on the vigilance and combat readiness of the armed defenders of socialism, on their ability to expose in good time an attack being prepared by an aggressor and deal him a crushing rebuff in any situation.

Gorbachev Meets Foundation Leadership

LD151446 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—The International Fund for the Survival and Development of Humanity was formed today in Moscow. Chairman of the fund's board of directors Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov of the USSR said this at a press-conference for Soviet and foreign journalists here.

Velikhov said that a meeting of the fund's leadership with General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev was held here today. "A very candid in-depth discussion of all problems ensued. It lasted for three hours. I think that meeting was an inspiring starting-point for our movement," the Soviet scientist said.

The aim of the fund is to support projects aimed at elucidating critical matters, the academician said. He noted that the termination of the arms race, above all, that of nuclear weapons, remains the cardinal problem of humanity. After the conclusion of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles the development of confidence-building measures, verification of existing agreements become the priority tasks. It is expedient to discuss these measures by joint efforts of various countries. Other global matters with which the fund will deal are environmental protection, education, preservation of cultural values, the problem of information. Velikhov noted that the idea of creating the fund was advanced last year at the international forum in Moscow for a nuclear-weapons free world for the survival of humanity.

The board of directors includes 30 intellectuals from various countries who do not represent either their countries, or the organizations of which they are members. The fund will be based on contributions of citizens or groups of citizens from various countries. It will have three centres: in Moscow, in Stockholm and in Washington.

Session Holds News Conference

PM181451 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "For Survival and Development"]

[Text] An "International Foundation for the Survival and Development of Mankind" has been set up at its constituent session, which has just ended in Moscow. Its leaders met 15 January at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center with Soviet and foreign journalists.

Opening the news conference, Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, chairman of the foundation's council of directors, recalled that the idea of forming this organization arose in February last year at the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World for the Survival of Humanity."

The foundation which has been set up—in which scientists, public figures, and cultural and religious representatives are involved—will have three centers: Moscow, Stockholm, and Washington. The task of this nongovernmental, independent organization financed by private individuals is to support projects designed above all to elucidate critical problems, the scientist pointed out. The arms race, and the nuclear arms race above all, continues to be one of the main threats to mankind's survival. Following the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles the elaboration of confidence-building measures and agreement verification [proverka] measures are coming to the fore. Other important problems also exist. They include, in the opinion of the vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, environmental pollution which recognizes no borders. There are also questions associated with the preservation and development of cultural and moral values. The foundation will also tackle all these.

The participants in the news conference pointed out the frankness and depth of a 3-hour conversation with M.S. Gorbachev. A PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER correspondent asked: Having gained Gorbachev's blessing, you would also, evidently, like to enlist Reagan's support?

J. Wiesner, deputy chairman of the council of directors (United States): I would not say that someone has given us their blessing. The constituent session took place in Moscow. We consider our initiative to be interesting and therefore we deemed it necessary to tell the general secretary about it and about our aims. He really spared us quite a lot of time and held what we consider to be an extremely substantive discussion with us. Of course, we are also ready to meet with President Reagan.

Speaking about the foundation's aims, Professor Wiesner stressed: There is, obviously, no need to list all the crises the modern world is encountering. Thus, we well know the danger of nuclear catastrophe but we do not fully realize the reality of the threat, supposing it to be a problem for future generations. When we speak of the environment we do not always understand either the urgency of the task of preserving it.

There is yet another sphere for our activity—the problems of developing countries. How can we speak of a world population increase if the conditions in which many people are forced to live are inhuman. Making a contribution to resolving questions associated with providing developing countries with food, knowledge, and the right to a free existence is only part of the tremendous work awaiting us.

Executive Director R. Bjoernerstedt (Sweden) said the foundation will seek projects of vital importance for mankind. We will endeavor to carry out tasks which no one else is tackling as yet. We will offer help to organizations which already exist so that they may be resolved more effectively.

At journalists' request the council of directors was introduced. Apart from the aforementioned leaders, also involved are S. Eisenhower, president of the D. Eisenhower Institute for International Problems; A. Hammer, president of the Occidental Petroleum Corporation; R. McNamara, former U.S. defense secretary; D.S. Ligachev, chairman of the Soviet Culture Foundation Board; Academicians T.I. Zaslavskaya, R.Z. Sagdeyev, and A.D. Sakharov; Metropolitans Volokolamskiy and Yurevskiy Pitirim; and scientific and cultural figures from Sweden, the FRG, Italy, Spain, Britain, Brazil, India, Canada, Israel, Bulgaria, the GDR, and other countries.

An FRG journalist asked how the foundation would be financed and what resources it has at its disposal.

Answer: It is somewhat premature to ask the newborn about this. During the foundation's organization, however, accounts were opened in three banks in the USSR. They hold the contributions from citizens of the Soviet Union, while the U.S. Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston has pledged to be our treasurer in the United States, where private donations already exist. The largest contribution is from Dr Hammer. He has donated $1 million.

A LOS ANGELES TIMES correspondent asked A. Hammer: Are the fund's ideas worth such expenditure?

A. Hammer: I think the money spent on arms could be spent more beneficially, in particular, on developing Third World countries where people are experiencing famine and poverty. I am glad to be among the first to contribute money to this foundation. I hope others will follow my example, for its aims are extremely commendable. I hope the time will come when we will be rid of all nuclear arsenals. The first step in this direction has already been taken. Intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will be eliminated. I am sure that subsequent measures to reduce nuclear weapons will be taken at the meeting between R. Reagan and M.S. Gorbachev in Moscow.

A spokesman for an Egyptian magazine asked A.D. Sakharov how he assesses the policy of genocide being conducted by Israel on the occupied Arab territories.

Answer: This is one of the stages in a tragedy which has been developing there for several decades. A way out can be found by means of a compromise. I hope such talks will be held, mutually acceptable solutions found, and Israel's state interests and those of the Arab peoples, including the Palestinians, observed.

Metropolitan Pitirim was asked: What will be the role of the Orthodox Church within the framework of the foundation which has been set up?

Answer: The spiritual values of the Orthodox Church, which have grown together with our fatherland, can give a practical incentive to this foundation's activity. The church is entering its millennial year. Many people are now acquiring a charge of energy in the cultural sphere by studying the monuments of the past and fashioning man's spiritual makeup in connection with the spiritual values of the church.

Work in the foundation is opening up a broad opportunity for cooperation between religious people and all religions of the world. The representative international conference which we held in Moscow ended 2 days ago. It was the first meeting of theologians and publicists whose aim was to search for a new world language in line with the new thinking for which all mankind is now calling. The foundation may also aid this avenue of cooperation between religions.

Representative of THE WASHINGTON POST: What is the foundation's potential in comparison with the capabilities of governments to remove the nuclear threat?

Ye.P. Velikhov: Governments are by no means always quick to take the necessary steps in this direction. For instance, the question of the possibility of verifying nuclear tests by technical means has been under discussion for decades in Geneva. More than 300 meetings have taken place at governmental level with no result. Soviet and U.S. scientists have carried out a series of experiments over 2 months after which no one can doubt that seismic surveys can monitor to any level the implementation of a nuclear test ban agreement. It seems to me it is the initiative from the two countries' scientists which has led to the achievement of an accord at governmental level on the further development of the seismic method. This is one of those examples whereby an organization independent of governments and which relies on international scientific and public opinion has proved to be more effective than official organs. USSR and U.S. scientists have a number of projects enabling, say, the presence of nuclear warheads on various carriers—ships, for instance—to be monitored. This shows that scientists and the public can forge a path for governments toward the conclusion of important agreements.

Gorbachev Addresses Foundation

PM18101 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Second Edition pp 1,4

[TASS report under the headline "Pooling Efforts To Resolve Common Human Problems—M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With the Leadership of the 'International Fund for the Survival and Development of Humanity'"]

[Text] As has already been reported, a meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and members of the leadership of the "International Fund for the Survival and Development of Humanity," who gathered in Moscow for their founding session took place in the Kremlin on 15 January.

The fund, the idea for which was submitted at the international forum "For a Nonnuclear World, for the Survival of Mankind" in Moscow in February last year, will give assistance, including material help, to the implementation of various research projects in problems of disarmament, ecology, and culture and will contribute to strengthening mutual understanding and cooperation between the public of various countries.

Addressing the participants in the meeting, prominent representatives of science, culture, business, and public circles from various countries, Mikhail Gorbachev said:

I am pleased to see you and to welcome your mission—yet another piece of evidence of the positive changes that are going on in the world. Each step in the movement along the path of peace and normalization of the international situation does not come about easily. But this process is in progress.

I do not want to be a pessimist or some kind of naive optimist. We must be realists. This is the most important thing, especially in politics. Therefore, we in the Soviet Union, in assessing the direction the international situation is taking, think a fundamental breakthrough for the better has not yet occurred, although positive trends have been generated in all areas—in disarmament, economics, and scientific and cultural cooperation.

I would particularly like to emphasize that all over the world the intelligentsia has greatly stepped up its activity: scientists, writers, workers in the arts. This is vastly important, considering the real weight of these people in society. The world is tired of tension and has reached a limit, a point in its development at which it has become clear to all—even to those with no experience in politics—that it is necessary to come to a halt and think what to do next.

I can assure you that we in the Soviet Union have realized this. We shall do everything to improve the international situation and promote peace.

The other day I had a meeting with representatives of our press and the leaders of the creative unions. We spoke at this meeting about our history, about its achievements, and its various periods—including the tragic ones. We tried once again to compare our assessments of and approaches to various periods in our history, to make the study of that history more profound and to understand all the complexity of its dialectic. In every period there were great efforts by the people, who labored in the name of the welfare of the country and moved it along the path of progress and socialism. Great acquisitions were made, which made this huge, multinational—but in the past backward country—into a modern state. There have been things that have held back our development and—more than that—inflicted enormous damage on the process of the development of socialism. That is also a fact.

From all this we draw lessons for today, as we conduct restructuring and seek to renew our society on the principles of democratization. Considerable effort is required for this. A restructuring of thinking is necessary. We have all traveled a certain road in this life. It has prepared us for recognition of the need for restructuring. We have the intellectual forces to take society along the road of democratization to open up the potential of our system. However, were this only the desire of intellectuals or politicians, that is, of some part of society, it would be of great, but not decisive, importance. The decisive thing is that this policy, the new ideas of restructuring, have been greeted with understanding by all society—the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, all working people. All this inspires hope that we will move forward, although not without struggle, not without difficulties.

At the meeting I am speaking of an idea was expressed: Not all that happens in our country depends only upon us, on our society, but also upon the kind of world we live in. We have felt that this is so. What is happening in the modern world, where everything is interlinked and interdependent, doubtless has a strong influence on each country, on the processes taking plae within it and, ultimately, on world politics as a whole. Only by taking into consideration this interlinking and interdependence we can think about the future and make plans in such a way as to rely not only on forces within our own society but also on intereaction with other nations and people. This is particularly important if you take into account that many problems of an international nature have accumulated. We call them ordinary problems common to all humanity, since they have faced all civilization.

All this dictated to us the need to seek the road of the new thinking, of interpreting the new realities and approaches to a better society. It is likely that in this we are still only at primary school level. We still have a great deal to do to make great strides along the chosen path. This applies to our restructuring. In exactly the same way there is still a great deal to understand and to achieve through joint efforts in the world to change the situation for the better.

The birth of the new organization you are representing here should also be viewed in the context of a changing world. These changes are characterized above all by increased mutual understanding and awareness of the need for cooperation and by a striving to live in peace, while remaining devoted to one's social, ideological, and religious choice. The one thing does not hamper the other.

This is natural in a world community that brings together such a varied mixture of people, each of which has its own destiny and its own traditions. Even the biggest countries—and I spoke of this recently to President Reagan—are, despite all their power, unable to neglect this or treat small people in an arrogant, big-power way. I think that the bigger a state is, the greater its responsibility is to both its own people and other people.

There would be very grave consequences if a large state and the government of such a state lacked a sense of responsibility to its own people and to the people of other countries.

I am certain that policy at the present time can be effective only if it is nourished by science and literature. It is hard to imagine the process of rapprochement between people without a moral basis, without humanity in world politics and without the humanizing of international relations. Politicians cannot do without the original and irreplaceable contribution of scientists and the social and intellectual forces of mankind. It is with an awareness of this that I greet all of you at the start of your journey and at the start of your work, and I wish you great success.

J. Wiesner (USA), vice president of the fund, spoke on behalf of the council of directors. He said he places great hope in the activities of the fund. The idea to set up such a fund emerged at the international forum in Moscow. Visiting many countries and talking to many people, especially scientists, I discovered in them an enormous desire for talents and human potential to be used in the interests of society, not for the arms race.

J. Wiesner stressed that the processes taking place in the USSR and the new view of the world as a single and interrelated whole which is now typical of Soviet foreign policy fill with hope those who believe in the need for mutual understanding and broad cooperation among the developed countries.

The following shared their ideas about the processes taking place in the world and the tasks confronting scientists and workers in culture the arts and business circles: A. Hammer (USA); D. Ligachev (USSR); A. Sakharov (USSR); Mrs S. Eisenhower (USA); J. Goldenberg (Brazil); R. Bjoernerstedt (Sweden); J. Stone (USA); D. McTaggart (Canada); B. Sendov (Bulgaria); F. Mayor (Spain); Metropolitan Pitirim (USSR); Ro. Sagdeyev (USSR); H. Stiller (GDR); M. Guttieres (Italy); M. Sela (Israel); F. Von Hippel (USA); H-P. Derr (FRG); H. Richter (FRG); W. Green (USA); R. Schneier (USA); Ye. Velikhov (USSR).

Specifically, the point in question was that the activity of the fund could become an important contribution to the promotion and development of the new thinking that is called upon to provide for mankind's survival in the face of nuclear threat, for the removal of the barriers of distrust impeding the strengthening of mutual understanding between countries and people.

Cooperation between representatives of science, culture, and the business world in implementing the fund's programs will make it possible to create a closer link between real politics and public opinion and to draw the attention of politicians and scientists to the evaluation of a broad spectrum of major problems of the present day.

The participants in the meeting regard the recent signing of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, which make it possible, for the first time in history, to eliminate a whole class of nuclear arms, as a specific manifestation of new approaches to international policy.

Participants in the meeting stressed that it is particularly important in the nuclear age to humanize international relations, to invest them with an ethical dimension, and to provide for the observance of universal human standards of morality in politics.

Regarding the problems of disarmament as one of the priority areas of the fund's activity, those who spoke also noted the great importance of uniting the efforts of the public of various countries for solving the problems of development.

Foreign guests showed a lively and sincere interest in the processes of restructuring and democratization of public life in the USSR, and spoke about the great international importance of changes taking place in our country.

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke in conclusion. He noted that he had listened with great interest to the opinions of participants in the meeting. One has to think over a lot of what you have said. All this is very serious. It seems to me that it is important for the fund's activity that the struggle for survival is linked to cooperation.

If the world does not make progress in terms of restructuring international relations, then it will also be difficult for the fund to implement its projects.

Therefore, I would say this: On one hand, the fund will sustain thinking and politics with necessary and important ideas, plans, proposals, and, finally, projects. On the other hand, it will itself be in a broad interrelationship with the entire world community. I think that if this interrelationship did not exist, then the fund would be deprived of nutritious roots. These roots are in society itself, in all its diversity. By uniting around itself great intellectual forces, the fund will be able, on the basis of these living links, to articulate the imperatives of the present world and pass them on to politicians in the form of scientifically founded conclusions. That is the most important thing.

I felt that you had not yet finished your discussion. You must still think well about how to structure the fund's work; and that is not a simple matter, especially as you have great, responsible plans.

As I have sensed at this meeting, two lines are appearing in the fund's work. I believe the fund will play its role if, by using scientific arguments and an understanding of the trends in world development, it has an influence on politics along the lines of forming new thinking. For myself, I feel that politicians need scientific arguments and scientific conclusions to make decisions, not only on domestic issues, but also on international matters. There is favorable soil for the fund here. One feels a great need for it and its recommendations. This does not mean, of course, that everybody will receive your judgments, proposals, and ideas in the same way. Nonetheless, they will be an important element in the development of more well-founded policies and the construction of international relations. That is the first point.

Second, there is no doubt that the fund can do a great deal if it is not going to be in an ivory tower, if it is not going to be isolated from those stormy processes taking place in the modern world, with all its fears and hopes.

If the work of the fund is not permeated with concern for the survival and development of humanity, nor connected with projects that truly stimulate progressive changes, it will not be justifying its destiny. It therefore seems to me that your idea of the need for the fund to have broad ties with public movements already having an immense influence on politics today is very correct.

As for the projects, they can be most diverse. I agree with the view expressed here with respect to the importance of the participation of scientists, including with the good offices of the fund, in stimulating the disarmament process. That is a priority task. Of course, I am not in the least underestimating ecological problems: They are acute today. Realistic cooperation in solving ecological problems is needed. A systematic and integrated approach is needed on problems of protecting the environment. I think that in using such public organizations as the fund interesting proposals on the internationalization of activity in the ecological sphere can be obtained.

This also applies to the problems associated with the scientific-technical revolution and its social consequences. These are problems profoundly affecting people's interests, and not only in countries that have lagged behind in their development and are endeavoring to share in scientific-technical progress: They are no less acute in the developed countries. The preservation of culture is naturally of enormous importance for the humanizing of international relations.

I feel the fund should look at the world realistically and see it as it is. Only realism will help you to identify the vitally important problems, draw the right conclusions, and make the right recommendations.

It is also impossible to disagree with you on the point that no government or group of governments must manipulate the fund's work or deflect it from solving the problems common to all mankind.

We shall precisely welcome this kind of activity, and promote it—not just morally, but practically.

In the time ahead of us, all the efforts of the Soviet leadership in foreign policy will be directed toward strengthening and developing the positive trends that have begun to emerge in international relations.

This means you will be able to expect from us new constructive efforts, above all in disarmament, especially nuclear.

We also think it is realistic to raise the question of a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms. Yet we are resolutely against allowing anyone, now that the process of disarmament is assuming realistic forms, to advance the arms race in other areas in a roundabout way.

When we raised the question of removing the intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear weapons from Europe, some people felt that Europe was finding itself in a "difficult" position. "Ideas" immediately appeared for getting around that agreement by upgrading the fleet, air force, and so on. The result is nonsense!

If we now reduce strategic offensive arms by 50% and go ahead with reducing such arms further, the question arises: What purpose, then, is served by these attempts to bypass that process by deploying sea-based cruise missiles?

We are categorically against this.

At the meeting in Washington we raised these matters in a very clear-cut way. It is impossible to terminate the arms race and really go over to the process of disarmament, if one's partner in negotiations has the feeling that he is being tricked and outflanked somehow. It is impossible to build international relations in this way.

If the arms race were transferred into space, that would be destabilization, and, therefore, one cannot agree to such an idea as a matter of principle. It is with difficulty—and the scientists are well aware of this—that we have drawn up the criteria for comparison and found our approaches to verification, on the basis of which the process of disarmament has eventually got under way on earth. If the arms race gets into space, the whole situation will change, and these are serious things. Therefore, our viewpoint—and we hope this is also the viewpoint of the public and even more so of scientists and representatives of intellectual circles with a particularly deep understanding of the situation—is that one cannot engage in disarmament in some spheres and extend the arms race in others. First, given such a state of affairs, the threat to mankind remains, and, second, the squandering of resources continues. This is our approach.

We are resolute supporters of moving ahead without reducing the pace of disarmament. In this respect, indeed, we are ready to go a long way. I think that at the stage of the negotiations on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles we showed the Soviet side's stock of constructiveness, and that stock will not decrease. Even greater flexibility and constructiveness will be required when we are engaged with strategic and offensive missiles. In this respect everything becomes more complex, and therefore a constructive approach is needed. It is necessary to see that the trust that began to develop between the partners in the talks is not destroyed by the attempts of the other side to somehow outwit its partner.

This is why there is a need for ethics at this meeting, where we respect each other's point of view, want to understand each other and, most of all, want to join forces to resolve complex problems.

We are confident that it is possible to solve the matter of the elimination of chemical weapons in the very near future. We are also ready to be understanding of the anxieties that exist with respect to conventional weapons, particularly in Europe. There is asymmetry. So let us move along the road toward a reduction in military confrontation.

I thank you for showing interest and expressing sympathy with our people, who are now implementing far-reaching plans in restructuring and renewing our society.

Mikhail Gorbachev related how restructuring is going in our country, what problems it is bringing to light, and what prospects are opening up before it.

J. Wiesner: I am delighted with what you have done and would like to be delighted with your future deeds.

Mikhail Gorbachev: We will try not to disappoint you, in any event. I am very pleased with this frank conversation. I think the forum's meetings and work must happen in the same spirit. In any event, we, the Soviet leadership, are open to direct conversation with you. We wish you successes on the road along which you have taken the first step. It is symbolic that this also coincides with the first step in nuclear disarmament. Let us act, bearing both in mind. Thank you, I wish you good health and courage. (applause)

Anatoliy Dobrynin, CPSU Central Committee secretary, took part in the meeting.

Sakharov Speaks to Conference

LD152206 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1710 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jan (TASS)—Prominent public figures, scientists, and representatives of business circles comprise the Council of Directors of the International Fund for the Survival and Development of Humanity, which was formed here today. They include: Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Academician Andrey Sakharov; Armand Hammer, the U.S. businessmen; Robert McNamara, former U.S. secretary of defense; Metropolitan Pitirim of the Russian Orthodox Church; Federico Mayor, UNESCO director-general,; and David McTaggart, president of Greenpeace.

The fund's main task is to facilitate research into solving critical issues and, above all, averting the nuclear arms race, said Yevgeniy Velikhov, chairman of the Council of Directors of the fund, at a news conference today for Soviet and foreign journalists. Now, following the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the elaboration of measures to build confidence and to verify existing agreements is moving to the forefront.

It was stated at the news conference that the fund will exist on the basis of private contributions by citizens or groups of citizens in different countries. During the process of its organization in the USSR an account has been opened at three banks containing donations from Soviet citizens. Donations have also been forthcoming from private individuals in the United States. The largest donation—$1 million—was made today by Armand Hammer.

Replying to questions from correspondents, Academician Andrey Sakharov said that the fund's activities "will doubtlessly reflect the connection of morality and culture with the survival and development of humanity."

Metropolitan Pitirim stated: "The Orthodox Church, which has a great spiritual tradition, can make a weighty contribution to the work of the new fund, calling on people to cooperate in the spiritual life."

The main strength of the fund, those establishing it said, are the real people who will be implementing plans leading to a nuclear-free and secure world.

Sakharov Recounts Gorbachev Meeting

LD151641 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—Academician Andrey Sakharov today described the newly-instituted International Fund for the Survival and Development of Mankind as a novel phenomenon which has been made possible only by the started democratization of Soviet society.

Speaking to newsmen at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's press center, he said that when the fund's board of directors had been received by Mikhail Gorbachev, he had met with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in person for the first time.

"For me the meeting was very interesting," Academician Sakharov said. "I think highly of Gorbachev both as a statesman and as a person. He impressed me as a man capable of talking candidly and of listening to the interlocutor and understanding him."

"He is a more dynamic kind of politician, one more capable of off-beat decisions. I think it is such a leader that is needed by a great country at this crucial moment in human history," he continued, adding:

"I find his position most promising."

Touching on the problem of a settlement regarding Afghanistan, Academician Sakharov said he stuck to his former opinion: "An early withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan is essential. As far as I know, certain progress has now been made in resolving the issue. I hope the withdrawal of Soviet troops will become a reality in a not so distant future."

Asked about the situation in Israeli-occupied territories, he said it was the latest page in the tragic history of the Middle East over the past several decades.

"A way out of the existing situation," Academician Sakharov said, "could be found through talks. I hope that as a result of negotiations compromises will be found and the state interests of Israel and the Arab peoples, including the Palestinian people, will be met with a solution satisfying all sides."

Petrovskiy, Others Hold News Conference

LD162314 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2020 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Announcer-read report on a news conference held at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center in Moscow on 16 January, with Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Fedorovich Akhromeyev; Academician Roald Zimurovich Sagdeyev of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs, introduced by Gennadiy Gerasimov; remarks by Petrovskiy, Akhromeyev, and Gerasimov are recorded]

[Text] [Gerasimov] Today we are holding a conference on the theme: For a nuclear-free and secure world. Taking part in the news conference are Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Fedorovich Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy minister of defense and General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces chief; Academician Roald Zimurovich Sagdeyev of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Committee of Soviet Scientists Against the Nuclear Threat chairman; and Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, USSR deputy Minister of foreign affairs, who will make a brief introductory address. Over to you.

[Petrovskiy] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, comrades. Yesterday, as you know, there was a meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the leadership of the International Fund for the Survival and Development of Mankind. The discussion in the Kremlin of topical issues of world politics and the role of scientists and the public in topical issues of world politics and the role of scientists and the public in promoting and developing the ideas of the new way of thinking, coincided with the second anniversary of the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU, in which the Soviet conception of security through disarmament is expounded, an innovatory program to free mankind, by the beginning of the 21st century, from nuclear, chemical and other threats to mankind.

The 15 January 1986 statement, which represents the new political thinking as applied to practical matters, and which has become a guide to action for the Soviet Union, radically renews international relations, their content, methods and style. Today, understanding of the fact that in the modern, mutually dependent world, any efforts to manipulate by force and to ensure one's own interests to the detriment of the interests of others will incur heavy costs both for oneself and for everyone else, is taking firm hold in the political awareness of states. The political reality of our times demands that account be taken of national state interests, organically in connection with the requirements of the survival of mankind.

The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, is an example of such an approach. This is a treaty which removes two classes of nuclear arms from the territory of nine states, and for the first time in history realizes the idea of all-embracing and profound control [kontrol] over disarmament. The conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. accord on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, denoting the fulfillment—ahead of time, at that—of two points of the 15 January statement, signifies that international relations have embarked upon a new stage, a stage of successful dialogue, and lays the basis for practical implementation of the program to rid mankind of nuclear weapons by the beginning of the year 2000. We are in favor of moving along the way to nuclear disarmament, without pauses and hold-ups. We see the priority task as coming to agreement with the United States within the first half of this year on a 50% cut in strategic offensive weapons, while observing the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972.

We are convinced that all necessary prerequisites exist for completing, within the very near future, work on a convention banning chemical weapons, and for starting to make a substantial cut in the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe, the region where their concentration is the most dangerous.

At the same time we are also in favor of perceptible steps on all other routes leading toward a nuclear-free and more secure world. We are in favor of full-scale Soviet-U.S. talks leading toward a complete and universal ban on tests of nuclear weapons being developed at an accelerated rate. We are in favor of implementation of the proposal for the creation of a corridor free of nuclear and chemical weapons in Central Europe; for the declaration of the Balkans and northern Europe to be nuclear-free zones; and for bringing in additional confidence measures at the line where the two military blocs confront each other. Altogether I must say there is no area of disarmament where the Soviet Union is not prepared to reach an understanding based upon a balance of interests. For us disarmament is both a main highway toward security and a means for releasing resources for development purposes.

[Unidentified announcer] A short statement was made at the news conference by Marshal of the Soviet Union Comrade Akhromeyev.

[Akhromeyev] Two years have passed, and a very great deal has been done during these 2 years thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union, the United States and other countries. Permit me to state, albeit very briefly, that in the first stage the plan envisaged an end to all nuclear explosions by the year 1990; the reduction of nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory by the United States and the Soviet Union by 50% over a period of between 5 and 8 years; the elimination of intermediate-range ballistic missiles and cruise missiles in the European zone; and the absence of any build-up in their own corresponding nuclear armaments by Britain and France. The subsequent stages: The second stage, up to the year 1995, and the third, up to the year 2,000, envisaged the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. During the 2 years that have passed since the publication of the statement a lot has been done. Talks are being held on ending nuclear tests. True, this problem has turned out to be much more complicated than we thought. Talks are being conducted on reducing strategic nuclear armaments by 50% by the Soviet Union and the United States, and it must be said that a lot of ground has been covered here. But we do not play down the difficulties, either. There are questions to which the solution has not yet been started.

[Unidentified announcer] Those taking part in the news conference replied to correspondents' questions. A number of questions dealt with the problem of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. Replying to them, Comrade Petrovskiy said:

[Petrovskiy] The problem of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is constantly within the field of vision of various international bodies and bilateral consultations between many countries. I am able to say that only yesterday Soviet-U.S. consultations on questions concerning the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons were completed. One aspect of this problem is of course connected with the situation in the so-called near-nuclear countries. The UN General Assembly has, in its repeated decisions, defined quite precisely the threat that is represented from the viewpoint of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons by Israel and South Africa. Pakistan, too, is one of the most dangerous potential hotbeds of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. I must say we have repeatedly told the Americans—and we do not make any secret of this—that the United States is untying Pakistan's hands and urging on its nuclear programs by supplying it with conventional weapons.

As mankind goes over to a nuclear-free world, supplementary legal regimes will be created which prevent the possibility of proliferating nuclear weapons, and we base our views on the fact that the central butress of a nuclear-free world will be the universalization of a commitment to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and also to the renunciation of the testing of nuclear weapons.

[Unidentified announcer] Correspondents were interested in the question of reducing conventional weapons. Consultations of the leaders of delegations and military representatives of the member states of the Warsaw Pact had been held in Moscow, Marshal Akhromeyev said. Problems relating to reducing dual-purpose systems were examined, that is, the sort of systems which can be used both as nuclear and as conventional weapons. It is a matter of tactical weapons. For the moment, the countries of NATO do not agree to discuss the problem of these weapons at the talks. This is incomprehensible to us. If strike aviation, tactical missiles, and artillery are to be excluded from the talks, then what will be the subject of the talks? Submachineguns and machine guns?

Possibilities of finding a way out of this situation are being sought. On 19 January, Comrade Akhromeyev reported, Soviet representatives will present new proposals. Is everything clear in matters relating to the elimination of nuclear weapons belonging to the two classes of missiles which are to be destroyed? Replying to this question, Academician Sagdeyev noted that the nuclear warhead of each missile would be dismantled. The chemical fuse and electronic mechanism would be destroyed. All of this would be carried out under supervision. It is important that nuclear materials should never again enter into nuclear weapons circulation. Specific technical resolutions are being proposed for their further use in the nuclear power industry for peaceful purposes.

Some questions concerned the situation in Afghanistan. Marshal Akhromeyev was asked: What aims was the Soviet Union pursuing in introducing its troops into Afghanistan 8 years ago?

[Akhromeyev] The Soviet Union introduced its limited contingent into Afghanistan at the repeated request—there were about 15 such requests—of the Afghan Government in connection with the fact that in 1979 the wide-scale interference of Pakistan and the United States in the internal affairs of Afghanistan had already become apparent, taken quite clear form. This is why the Soviet

Union introduced a limited contingent of its troops into Afghanistan. If such interference should be stopped, then the reason our units were introduced into Afghanistan will disappear, and consequently at that time the troops will be withdrawn. So we were not pursuing any other aims in Afghanistan.

[Unidentified announcer] A question was asked concerning the U.S. military bases around the Soviet Union. This problem, Marshal Akhromeyev said as before, remains acute. On the territory of foreign states—in Turkey, Greece, the FRG, Norway, the Philippines, Japan, the Aleutian Islands, in the Indian Ocean, a number of countries of the Arab world—The United States has more than 1,000 military bases. This places a considerable strain on Soviet-U.S. relations. The Soviet Union is, for the moment, not stressing this matter so as not to bring the process for the reduction of strategic nuclear forces to a standstill. But the time will come, and we will return to this matter.

[Gerasimov] The Bulgarian newspaper TRUD raises the matter of the situation in the field of naval armaments.

[Petrovskiy] The matter of beginning talks on limiting naval activities and stopping the arms race at sea has already been cited on more than one occasion at international forums. It must be said that a very active role in this is being played by Sweden, which is constantly advancing this matter at the United Nations. Our countries, the socialist countries, and in particular the People's Republic of Bulgaria, are also playing a very active role, proposing that talks begin on this matter. Talks can also be broached on a global level. Talks can also be engaged in regional aspects. There are our proposals for starting talks on reducing the activity of naval fleets in the Pacific Ocean, on withdrawing Soviet and U.S. fleets from the Mediterranean, on securing guarantees of security in the Indian and Pacific oceans, including the Persian Gulf and the Molucca straits. Finally, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, now on a visit to Sweden and Norway, has just offered to hold consultations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO on the matter of naval activity, and if they are not ready to start such full-scale consultations, then to hold a meeting, if only for a beginning, of the corresponding experts.

[Unidentified announcer] Those taking part in the news conference replied to other questions asked by correspondents.

News Conference 'Staging Post'

PM181641 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Toward Nuclear Disarmament—Without Stopping. News Conference for Soviet and Foreign Journalists"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] Great is the interest of world public opinion in this truly revolutionary process which began 15 January 1986. A good half of the meetings which took place at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center last year were in one way or another associated with questions of implementing the Soviet concept of security. The news conference "For a Nuclear-free, Safer World" which took place here 16 January, assembling representatives of all the leading news agencies, newspapers, and television companies, was a sort of 2-year staging post along this path.

V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, addressed the journalists with a brief analysis of the situation prevailing today on the different flanks of disarmament. [passage omitted]

S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, reminded journalists of the stages in eliminating nuclear weapons by the end of the 20th century, as set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's [15 January 1986] statement. Over the past 2 years, he emphasized, quite a lot has been done. The document on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has been signed. Talks on halting nuclear tests and on halving Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive weapons given the observance of the ABM Treaty are under way. But there are also questions which we have not yet begun to resolve. We underestimated the fact that there exist in the world forces which are openly opposed to nuclear disarmament. Not all minds have absorbed the new thinking entailing the necessity and objective inevitability [zakonomernost] of eliminating nuclear weapons. But progress is evident. For it is a fact that the implementation of the plan to eliminate nuclear weapons has begun.

A question was asked concerning the prospects for ratification of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Answer: Diverse viewpoints on this score are being expressed in the Soviet press. Of course, we should not simplify or dramatize the impending discussion. The balance of interests reached during the Washington talks should be explained to our country's public thoroughly and in great detail.

Do you agree with the viewpoint of M.S. Gorbachev, who considers that the concept of nuclear deterrence has become obsolete?—the correspondent of the newspaper ASAHI put this question to Marshal S.F. Akhromeyev.

Answer: This is the opinion of both the USSR's political and military leadership. We should not continue to arm ourselves and accumulate nuclear weapons [vooruzhatsya i nakaplivat yadernyye vooruzheniya dalshe nelzya]. This will objectively create an ever increasing threat to peace. But nuclear disarmament has also proved to be a very complicated problem. It is essential that there is the trust between states on which nuclear arms reduction could be based. Definite prerequisites for improving relations between the USSR and the United States on all other questions were essential before the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed. It is also necessary that equilibrium is maintained and that the approximate equality of strategic nuclear forces between the Soviet Union and the United States is not broken. Strict monitoring [kontrol] of the observance all the agreements signed is essential. [passage omitted]

Various aspects of the situation around Afghanistan were discussed. It was explained that, providing that outside interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is stopped, all Soviet troops will be withdrawn from the country. It was stressed that the Soviet Union has not been and is not pursuing any military aims in Afghanistan.

Concerning the coming round of Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva, there are, in V.F. Petrovskiy's opinion, individual factors requiring agreement, but it is fully possible to agree on them. They are not insurmountable. If the Pakistani side demonstrates a constructive approach, then no difficulties will arise. The documents being prepared in Geneva are the basis for a political settlement. There are four. An Afghan-Pakistani agreement on the principles of mutual relations and, in particular, on noninterference and the rejection of intervention, which is absolutely essential for beginning Soviet troop withdrawal. Also an Afghan-Pakistani agreement on the voluntary return of refugees. The third document is a declaration on international guarantees on the part of the Soviet Union and the United States. Finally, there is a document on interrelationships. A conditional designation, but essentially it must enshrine the coordination of all the elements of a settlement.

Bulgarian journalists asked whether the awesome and extremely expensive naval armaments were slipping out of the field of view.

Answer: Indeed, we are holding talks on the most diverse aspects of disarmament, but not on naval forces. The United States and its allies are opposed to this. It is time to also include the sides' naval forces on the agenda. The sooner the better.

The question of beginning talks on limiting naval activity and ending the arms race at sea has been raised many times at international forums. Sweden, the socialist countries, and Bulgaria in particular are playing an active role in this. The aim of the Soviet proposals is to reduce the activity of the Pacific Ocean navies, withdraw Soviet and U.S. ships from the Mediterranean, and provide security guarantees in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, including the Persian Gulf and the Strait of Malacca. During his visit to Sweden and Norway N.I. Ryzhkov suggested holding consultations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO on the question of naval activity.

At the request of a Japanese newspaper for an explanation of the expression of "reasonable sufficiency," Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev, deputy chairman of the "Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat," noted that until we become a world completely free of nuclear weapons we must first of all try to arrive at an equilibrium whereby the nuclear forces for potential retaliation would be brought into line with the most elementary common sense.

Soviet scientists are convinced that it is possible to arrive at an intermediate strategic equilibrium at a level of just 5% of the current nuclear arsenals.

In reply to one question the USSR deputy foreign minister said: The deeper we go into talks with the United States the more acute becomes the problem of that country's military bases sited around the USSR. They are in the Aleutian Islands and, unfortunately, the Japanese islands, the Philippines, the Indian Ocean, and certain Arab countries. They are in Turkey, Greece, the FRG, and Norway. There are more than a thousand such bases around our country, which is a considerable burden on Soviet-U.S. relations.

Further on News Conference

LD161654 Moscow World Service in English
1410 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] A news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists has been held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Moscow press center under the slogan: A Nuclear-Free and Safe World, From a Balance of Force to a Balance of Interests. The occasion was the second anniversary of the Soviet program to eliminate nuclear and chemical arms and other weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000.

One of the main questions at the news conference was that of Soviet understanding of the reasonable sufficiency principle applied to nuclear arsenals and conventional weapons. Answering the journalists, the director of the Space Research Institute of the Academy of Sciences, Roald Sagdeyev, noted that even 5 percent of the world nuclear arsenals would be enough for a policy of nuclear deterrent. And the chief of the Soviet general staff, Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev added that the concept of nuclear deterrent was outdated; its further application could destabilize the situation. What we need now, said Marshal Akhromeyev, is mutual trust to carry out nuclear disarmament.

[Begin Akhromeyev recording in Russian, fading into English translation] Speaking of strategic offensive weapons possessed by both the Soviet Union and the United States, the Marshal said, we are guided by the principle of armed balance. Unfortunately, the existing degree of mutual trust permits only strictly measured equal reductions of those weapons, and both sides accept the need not to tip the strategic balance. After slashing by one-half the strategic offensive weapons, we could proceed to different principles, noted Marshal Akhromeyev.

Concerning conventional weapons and armed forces, we follow the principle of reasonable sufficiency, enough to provide the adequate defence of the Soviet Union and its allies. That principle leads us to agree to eliminating more missiles than the United States. We hope the American side will appreciate our position and will also be guided by reasonable sufficiency in our further talks, said Marshal Akhromeyev.

The news conference pointed out that the Soviet-American missiles treaty signal the fulfillment ahead of the planned schedule of two points in the Soviet Union's program for abolishing nuclear arms on Earth by the year 2000 put forth on 15 January 1986. With the Washington treaty the international relations entered a new stage of productive dialogue.

The news conference also focussed on unblocking international crises with an emphasis on the Afghan issue. A Soviet deputy minister of foreign affairs, Vladimir Petrovskiy, said a basis for solving the issue was to be laid by documents which were being drawn up in Geneva. These documents include an Afghan-Pakistani treaty on the principles of bilateral relations, the two countries' treaty on the return home of Afghan refugees, a declaration on international guarantees by the Soviet Union and the United States, and an agreement of all interested parties on coordinating all elements of the settlement, including the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

Participants on Afghan Question

LD161400 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1320 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, Jan 16 (TANJUG)—Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy said today he hoped that four documents, which should constitute the basis for a political settlement to the Afghanistan question, would be signed in Geneva.

Addressing a press conference, Petrovskiy said that the documents include an Afghanistan-Pakistan agreement on the principles of bilateral relations and non-interference in internal affairs, another document drawn up by the two countries on the voluntary return of refugees, international guarantees by the Soviet Union and the United States for the implementation of these agreements, and a general document wtich would set out the date for the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Petrovskiy and chief of staff of the Soviet Armed Forces Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, who also attended the conference, said they expected that the February round of the Afghanistan-Pakistan talks with the mediation of special envoy of the U.N. Secretary General Diego Cordoves would to be the final one.

Marshal Akhromeyev said that the Soviet Union had "no military goals in Afghanistan" and that it only responded to appeals for help (there were 15 of them, he said) from the Afghanistan Government.

There will be no Soviet weapons in Afghanistan after the withdrawal of our troops from that country, he said.

He did not want to answer the question how many Soviet soldiers had been killed in Afghanistan.

Today's press conference was convened to mark the second anniversary of Mikhail Gorbachev's plan to eliminate nuclear arms. Summing up the results, Marshal Akhromeyev said that good prospects existed for a ban on chemical weapons, a 50-percent reduction of strategic arms and a reduction of conventional weapons in Europe.

Afghan-Pakistani Talks

LD161222 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1118 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jan (TASS)—"There are good prospects for attaining definitive accords at the forthcoming round of Afghan-Pakistani negotiations in Geneva conducted through the personal representative of the UN secretary general," Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, stated today. He was speaking here at a news conference on the subject, "For a nonnuclear and secure world, from a balance of forces to a balance of interests".

Answering a question from a TASS correspondent, he said that during the visit to the USSR in last December by Diego Cordovez, personal representative of the UN secretary general, a thorough exchange of views took place on concrete steps necessary for the swift conclusion of the Geneva settlement process. "But it would be incorrect to maintain that absolutely all the issues have already been resolved," Petrovskiy noted. "There are individual points which still need to be agreed to during the concluding round, but it is perfectly possible to reach agreement on them. If the Pakistani side displays a constructive approach in sufficient measure, no difficulties will arise."

Petrovskiy on INF

LD161319 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—Prospects for ratification of the INF treaty by the Soviet side attracted journalists' increased attention today at a news conference at the press centre of the Ussr Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

"The ratification business will not be an easy one", maintains Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR. At the same time he said prospects for ratification of the treaty by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet should not be dramatised.

"We attentively study the public opinion", he said. "Soviet people ask a lot of questions. We are to explain to the public in detail the essence of the balance of interests achieved during the conclusion of the treaty in Washington on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles."

A question about the utilisation of nuclear warheads was asked at the news conference. In answer to the question academician Roald Sagdeyev, chairman of the Soviet Scientists' Committee in Defence of Peace, Against the Nuclear Threat, said that the nuclear warheads subject to elimination under the treaty would be dismantled. The nuclear fissionable substance would be withdrawn from them, and the remainder—a chemical fuse and electronics would be destroyed under the supervision of experts.

The scientists of many countries suggest ways for utilising fissionable materials—plutonium and highly-enriched uranium—in the nuclear power industry and in other civilian branches.

What is important is to prevent these materials from being reused in nuclear weapons, Sagdeyev emphasized.

He highly appreciated the proposal by Dr. Jeremy Stone, one of the leaders of the Federation of American Scientists, who urged the governments of nuclear powers to reach agreement on stopping the production of fissionable materials for military purposes.

Plane Downing Raises Questions

LD161407 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1255 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, Jan 16 (TANJUG)—Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy said today that the "investigation in Seoul of the South Korean plane disaster raises a number of questions."

Commenting on yesterday's accusations from Seoul that the DPR of Korea allegedly organized the planting of an explosive in the South Korean passenger plane, Petrovskiy said that the the DPR of Korea had been accused even before the investigation started.

The government of the DPR of Korea strongly rejected the accusations, said Petrovskiy, adding that the Soviet stance "against all forms of international terrorism is already known."

'International Observers Roundtable' Program

LD171908 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 17 Jan 88

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, Moscow Television and Radio political observer; with Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor-in-chief of TRUD; and Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, international affairs journalist]

[Text] [Zholkver] Hello, Comrades! A memorable anniversary was marked last week: 2 years ago, on 15 January 1986, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made a statement setting out the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament. We have to admit, colleagues, that to many people, including some in our country, this program seemed at first sight to be verging on the fantastic. But 2 years have gone by, and this program—not simply and not without difficulty maybe—but this program is being implemented. A few days ago I saw an interesting report from London. A session of the Executive Committee of the international movement Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War was taking place there, and one of the cochairmen of this movement, Professor Lown, a well-known U.S. cardiologist, said this to journalists: In the past they used to call us idealists and dreamers when we talked about the possibility of reducing nuclear armaments. Now, following the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty in Washington, nuclear disarmament has become a reality. Indeed the first bricks in the foundations of a nuclear-free world were laid at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Washington, if one may put it in those terms. You had occasion to be among the journalists who reported this meeting, Rudolf Georgiyevich. What, in your opinion, are the first results and what are the further prospects for the building of this nuclear-free world?

[Kolchanov] Those who remember how international events have developed over, say, the past 15 years have been able to perceive the difference between some of the peace initiatives or broad peace-loving assurances which were made in different countries including our country in the sixties and what was done on 15 January 1986. Yes, you were indeed correct when you recalled that many people thought that this was fantasy, utopia, and so on. And I think even that there were some people in the West who specially cultivated that impression of the program set out by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 for the very reason that it was an absolutely realistic program and was the first real step in the implementation of the new political thinking. I would like to stress especially its constructive nature. Look what it had to say at that time about intermediate-range missiles: It was envisaged directly that intermediate-range missiles would be eliminated during the first stage, within a period of between 6-8 years. The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles which was signed in Washington on 8 December goes even further in this area, eliminating not just the intermediate-range missiles but shorter-range missiles. Nuclear weapons are being eliminated over a huge band of ranges, from 500-5,500 kilometers. In this case, therefore, a proposal contained in the Statement made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 has been implemented.

[Zholkver] I would even say that this goes further than the task that was set, for at that time the question was only being raised of eliminating missiles in Europe, and now these missiles are being destroyed, Soviet and U.S. ones, across the globe, including those in Asia.

[Kolchanov] Of course the fact that the treaty has been signed does not mean that the treaty has gone into effect. It has to be ratified. The United States begins discussion of the treaty in the Foreign Affairs Committee on 19 January. Mr Shultz will be the main witness before the committee. Then it will be examined in Congress and some time provisionally expected to be around April or May—according to the predictions of international observers and political observers—there will be the decisive ratification battle. Naturally in view of the fact that discussion of the treaty is starting, the U.S. congressmen are not expressing their attitudes very much in advance of what they are going to say when the discussions really do start. If one is to judge by the U.S. press, therefore, only some 12 to 15 senators have definitely decided to oppose it. As you know, esteemed listeners, 66 votes are needed in order for the treaty to be ratified, and from this point of view things are apparently, more or less, all right. But these are forecasts that must be treated with caution, of course.

[Zholkver] I would note that it seems to me that here perhaps we shouldn't be dealing just with the simple arithmetic, perhaps there's some algebra here, too. What lies behind these figures, and perhaps we shouldn't even be dealing just with the problem of say how many missiles are going to be destroyed—they're now giving figures of 3%, 4%, and some of our listeners write and say that it's a very small amount. But I would like to quote what was said by the president of the Senate, Bush, the U.S. vice-president. He, incidentally, is sure that the Senate is going to ratify the treaty. But he states that the important thing is not the fact that we are eliminating a small percentage of the nuclear arsenal, but the fact that we are getting away from the stereotypes of the past. We are rejecting the continual buildup of arsenals of weapons. We are moving towards greater stability and security. Of course, we are not going to start concealing the fact that election considerations are playing a part here. It is known that Bush is putting forward his own candidacy for the Presidency. The election campaign is now unfolding and incidentally the statements of other senators and congressmen are to a large extent linked with this.

But indeed it is not just the military and political consequences of this treaty, if you like, that are important but the psychological ones, too. It seems to me that this is also important in one's approach to an extremely important problem like that of verification [kontrol], Aleksandr Aleksandrovich. There's no point in hiding it, for a very long time there has been no solution to this problem from our own side, either. And this has slowed down the solution of a whole range of disarmament questions. Don't you think that there has now been a psychological breakthrough, if you like, in this respect, too?

[Lebedev] I am completely in agreement with you. This is of course a breakthrough, it is not just an advance, because it is perhaps the most vivid, visible, and real confirmation of this new political thinking which is asserting itself, albeit with some pain and some difficulty, in international relations and in our relations with the United States in such a key area as disarmament. And I am in agreement with you in the sense that of course, to be honest, we have embarked here on an equally radical revision of some of our own ideas about the role of secrecy in international stability and in preserving parity and balance between ourselves and the United States, and this revision is now bearing visible and specific fruit.

But here you mentioned the problem of ratification, Rudolf Georgiyevich. This is indeed now an aspect of the implementation of the Washington accords which is coming into the foreground, and I have no doubt that in the next few weeks and months the world's press and our own press, too, of course, will be filled with reports that will sometimes certainly be dramatic and sometimes almost heart-rending about the way the balance you were talking about is shaping up there, Rudolf Georgiyevich, how some senator or other has gone over to the other side, and so on. It seems to me that given all the drama, so to speak, of this ratification process, as it is deliberately and persistently depicted by the U.S. side, it seems to me that in its egocentrism, if it may be put like that, it forgets that there is a second side involved in ratification, the Soviet Union and the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In fact you mentioned, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, that questions are being asked about why more warheads are being eliminated by our side and fewer by the U.S. side, aren't we losing out, and so on. I don't doubt that of course such questions will not be being asked just in the Senate: They are going to be asked in the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Houses of the Supreme Soviet; they are going to be asked by our own public and press. The ratification process certainly applies to both sides and the senators, I would put it like this, ought to take this into account.

For example, a great deal is now being said about the fact that a group of right-wing senators is preparing a so-called wrecking amendment, that is to say an amendment which, if it is passed, might distort the whole content of the treaty or tie this treaty, bind its ratification to conditions of some kind that have no direct relevance to this area, and so on. Further more fears about "preparations" in quotation marks, of this kind, that is to say preparations of a negative kind, have been expressed by Margaret Thatcher, too. Senator Biden, a

U.S. senator, travelled through Western Europe sounding out the views of the allies, and he took back to Washington first hand, so to speak, a report that the West European members of NATO, and also the nonmembers of NATO, were all unanimous now in supporting ratification as soon as possible. Thatcher pointed out specifically that the passing of any wrecking amendment would have disastrous consequences for NATO. And what is it that they are complaining about? I go back to where I started. It is what you said, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, the verification system. This is the first treaty in history in which a verification system has been thought through in the finest detail and in which such severe measures have been envisaged. So that the experience itself that has been acquired in the process of working out these measures is already providing an extremely powerful push towards speeding up the reaching of accords in other areas, and in particular in the area of strategic offensive weapons.

[Zholkver] Yes, and indeed this very week a new round in Soviet-U.S. talks began in Geneva. On the agenda first and foremost is the question of the 50% reduction in offensive armaments by the United States and the Soviet Union. It is not a simple matter, but the foundations have been laid. You were saying, Rudolf Georgiyevich, that this problem was examined in Washington, too, so what are the chances here, for this is also a most important point of our program for nuclear disarmament as set out in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's Statement of 15 January—the reduction of strategic offensive armaments.

[Kolchanov] But if you want to talk about what the chances are, then I think that every listener is awaiting an answer as to whether this treaty will be signed when Reagan arrives this summer. Of course, I don't think anyone will really be prepared to answer this question either positively or negatively. In any event, work on the treaty is underway; the significance of it scarcely calls for extensive comment. And if 3-4% of the nuclear potential is eliminated by the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, then one is talking here about an immense quantity of missiles and an even greater quantity of warheads, with the so-called framework agreement with an established figure of 1,600 delivery vehicles and 6,000 warheads...

[Zholkver, interrupting] ...due to remain.

[Kolchanov] Due to remain, yes. This is considerably fewer than there actually are, so that...

[Zholkver, interrupting]...the scale is smaller.

[Kolchanov, continuing] there are half as many, so the significance of it is immense. But I would like to say that even now, prior to the new round, it can be stated that attacks on the medium-range missile treaty have intensified, if only to ensure that fragments fly off in the direction of the talks on strategic offensive armaments. What do I mean by this?

I mean statements by U.S. senators and politicians who are either starting to make connections, as Aleksandr Aleksandrovich rightly said, with various secondary problems, with accusations that it is impossible to verify in the Soviet Union, that the Soviet Union will undoubtedly hide something, that we will strip Europe bare, so to speak, by this treaty, that the Soviet Union has a preponderance of conventional weapons, and so on.

So what we are talking abut is, on the one hand, a noisy propaganda campaign and, on the other, and Aleksandr Aleksandrovich in my view also referred very opportunely and precisely to blocking amendments, and third, I would say, we are talking about specific acts against this treaty which also hit at the talks on strategic offensive armaments. In particular, the Pershing-2 tests are still going on. Why, one might ask? After all, we agreed that they would be eliminated. Nevertheless, tests are continuing. One Soviet diplomat called this stubble on the face of a corpse. If only that were so! After all, stubble on a corpse's face ceases to grow, but the tests must be stopped by means of some kind of deliberate and specific action, otherwise one will not know how long they will go on. And I would also include the various NATO plans for various kinds of rearmament and compensation as among the real blows to the treaty and the talks on strategic offensive armaments.

[Zholkver] I would also point out another aspect which simply must be taken into consideration, and that is the fact that a forthcoming treaty on a reduction in strategic offensive armaments is inseparably linked with adherence to the open-ended Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty.

[Kolchanov] There's an agreed period.

[Zholkver] Yes. This very question will also be discussed now: I have seen President Reagan's statement that he has instructed his delegation at Geneva to prepare a new agreement with regard to the deadline for not withdrawing from this agreement. Because it would, of course, be absurd to reduce and eliminate nuclear armaments on earth and at the same time work on putting these armaments into space, which would be even more dangerous.

But Rudolf Georgiyevich, you yourself referred to the interrelation between these two treaties—the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and the treaty on strategic offensive armaments—and other types of armaments, for example tactical nuclear weapons, or so-called dual-purpose weapons, which could be used with both conventional and nuclear warheads. Of course, if we are talking not about the arithmetic but about the political algebra of all this, then we should be talking about the main direction, as it was put in Mikhail

Sergeyevich Gorbachev's Statement of 15 January, so that the world might move in the direction of eliminating nuclear weapons completely and not of modifying them.

[Lebedev] Yes, it seems to me, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, that you have touched upon a very proper topic here. We are all the time emphasizing and we rejoice in the fact that the program put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev 2 years ago has started to be implemented. And in this context I think that one of the most important political consequences of it has been the fact that a differentiation is now occurring in the West's positions. When, let's say, one reads statements by U.S. officials and then by West European ones you can see the difference, and a fundamental difference it is too, because it is arguably our approach—I may be indulging in a bit of wishful thinking here—that is gradually assuming the upper hand in the United States right now.

[Zholkver] You mean a realistic approach?

[Lebedev] I mean even a realistic view of nuclear weapons, that is that one can get by without them. And this view is now being voiced in the United States, although at times from positions which are undoubtedly diametrically opposed to ours. For example, the other day a report was published by a commission which was made up basically of people who may now be considered as ex-officials, such as Kissinger and Brzezinski, but led by Deputy Secretary Ikle.

[Zholkver] The deputy defense secretary:

[Lebedev] The deputy defense secretary. And this report says that it is time NATO stopped placing such emphasis on nuclear strategy, and that nuclear weapons are impermissible in the sense of using them as weapons in a real war. But Western Europe, through Thatcher and the French leadership, speaking first and foremost as possessors of nuclear weapons, keeps saying over and over again that peace in Europe is not possible without some kind of minimum number of nuclear weapons on European territory.

[Kolchanov] We are now talking about the implementation of the points of the program which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev set out on 15 January 1986. But we must, I think, say that the implementation of certain points is moving ahead with difficulty, in particular the limitation and—what would be even better—the ending of nuclear tests. It was referred to there. How do things stand now in this matter? Perhaps you could say a few words about this.

[Zholkver] Yes, this is an important, a fundamentally important direction of our program to create a nuclear-free world, because everybody realizes that nuclear tests lead to the perfection of such weapons. In no way is it—as it was once said—to check whether or not they had rusted away in the nuclear arsenals. Other possibilities exist for this purpose. We are also talking about the modernization of these weapons. And here substantive progress has been made. In the first place, at that same meeting in Washington, the desire was reaffirmed to continue full-scale Soviet-U.S. talks on a complete end to nuclear tests. I recall that the Soviet Union has always been ready to hold such talks. The United States at one time made all this dependent upon the supposed impossibility of monitoring nuclear tests, and then at the end of it all quit the talks altogether. These talks are now being resumed. That is important, and not only are they being resumed in Geneva, but, if one may put it this way, organized preparation for a complete end to these tests is in progress. And now, for the first time, and this is also a sign of the times, U.S. experts will be working at the Soviet nuclear test site near Semipalatinsk, and in the near future Soviet experts—our experts—will be at the test site in Nevada.

[Kolchanov] It would, of course, be better to end nuclear tests immediately and absolutely, but the path which we are traveling is also leading to the goal. We are talking about a limitation first of all of the capacity of the nuclear explosions, and their frequency, and this is also a step in the right direction.

[Lebedev] Of course, but you see every time we come back to the same subject—the reality of and the prospects for achieving this goal of a nuclear-free world, a world without violence. But I mentioned Western Europe once again because this delineation is now proceeding in a very complex manner.

For example, recently I read an article by Admiral Eberle, director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London. He, perhaps for the first time, succinctly states that the time has come when the interests of the United States and of Western Europe are at variance regarding the prospects for European security in the military sphere. Because, Adm Eberle says, if it is of advantage to the United States, if it is in the interests of its security to rid itself of nuclear weapons both in Europe and perhaps even in the global sense, then it is not of advantage to Europe.

It's always the same old argument: because, they claim, there is an imbalance in conventional weapons between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, so this can only be compensated by a certain nuclear arsenal on the side of the West. But why does one always have to follow such logic? After all, there is another logic too, and we are constantly reiterating our proposal to the West and NATO, and not only to the NATO members, that if you are going to talk about an imbalance, an assymetry, then you have to discuss specific spheres in which such assymetry exists and strive for a balance at constantly falling levels, by reducing arms rather than by compensation on the Western side through nuclear weapons. But regrettably, despite the fact that with many Western European countries—with Britain, the FRG and, on the whole, with France as well—we are now constantly engaged in a productive dialogue on matters relating to disarmament, measures for military trust and others, on this issue one very frequently still gets the feeling that one's up against a wall of incomprehension.

[Zholkver] All the same, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, I would disagree with you there and say that, here too, there are certain positive shifts in the Western European attitude toward these problems as well. First and foremost, I would note the indisputably positive role played by the FRG in concluding the intermediate-range missile treaty. As we know, all 108...

[Lebedev, interrupting] Yes, that's true.

[Zholkver] All 108 Pershings are located on FRG territory, plus cruise and Pershing-1A missiles, and here the FRG government has played a positive role. That's the first thing. Secondly, let's take Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's visits to Sweden and Norway which have just ended. As far as Sweden is concerned, its energetic role in nuclear disarmament issues is common knowledge. Great services were performed by Olof Palme, one of the original founders of the organization of Six states from five continents which energetically campaign both against nuclear tests and for nuclear arms reductions. Incidentally, those states have also offered their services in matters relating to worldwide verification of adherence to a nuclear test ban treaty.

As for Norway's stance, as a NATO country, the Norwegian government has fully applauded the Washington treaty and is also now actively engaged in examining measures for limiting military activity in the north of Europe. New Soviet proposals have now been put forward. As is known, the foundations were laid in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's Murmansk speech, which spoke of limiting military activity in the seas adjacent to the European North. This sphere has now been expanded in Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's speeches to include the Barents Sea as well, the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe and the holding of consultations between experts, including one in Leningrad on issues relating to naval activity and to limiting naval activity. So here it seems to me that this movement is occurring in Western Europe as well.

[Kolchanov] Let's turn again to the text of the statement made 732 days ago. One of the major problems discussed in it was the elimination and banning of chemical weapons. Chemical arms talks are now underway, and virtually all the main issues of a future convention have been resolved—the question of destroying chemical weapons stocks and the industrial base for their production, and the question of verification. But is everything quite so fine, if we recall that on 16 December last year—that is, just 1 month ago—the Americans embarked on the production of binary weapons? What can be said about this? I think that slamming the door is not the best way to act at the chemical weapons talks in connection with this commencement of binary weapons production. At the same time, our stance here is an extremely principled one. Since it is the elimination of chemical weapons which is under discussion, no types of new chemical weapons should fall outside that convention, or else, in my view, the convention would not have much meaning. We cannot destroy old chemical weapons, for instance, and allow some new type which is said to be completely safe in storage. For it's not just a question of storage; it's a question, above all, of the purpose of any type of weapon.

[Zholkver] I think, colleagues, that in examining all aspects of disarmament—nuclear, conventional and chemical disarmament—we should perhaps not dismiss the economic factor, which is another factor of no small importance. After all, arms production is an enormous abyss into which billions of dollars, rubles and Western European currencies are being poured. It is no coincidence that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement also raised the question of replacing the present scandalous arms build-up instead of development with disarmament for the sake of development, which is need so much by all of us.

Here too, of course, none of this is simple. For example, the conference on these issues that we had hoped for, which should, incidentally, have taken place in Paris in 1986, did not take place here, not least because of opposition from France's governing circles. But it did take place in 1987 in New York, and despite opposition again, this time from U.S. circles, an overwhelming majority voted to adopt a program for reducing military appropriations in order to use that money, of which we are all in such great need, for the needs of all mankind.

[Lebedev] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, that is without doubt a very important subject and an important aspect, but let us remember nevertheless that we are still only in the very initial phase of implementation of that program for nuclear disarmament and movement toward a nuclear-free world.

[Kolchanov, interrupting] Yes, but, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich...

[Lebedev, interrupting] There are a lot of complexities, but I would like to remind you of the main task for today: to ensure survival for the whole of mankind, because not a single nuclear warhead has yet been destroyed. We are reminded that this task remains a priority at present and for a long time to come by the meeting which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has just held with the directorate of the Fund for the Survival and Progress of Mankind. I would remind you that the idea of setting up such a fund was put forward a year ago at the Moscow Forum.

[Kolchanov] And this fund should, of course, be regarded as an important component of a worldwide public movement.

[Lebedev] Unquestionably, it is, after all, a think-tank for ideas on how to accelerate mankind's movement toward that objective. A whole range of interesting thoughts and ideas were expressed at the public forum, and these have been subsequently taken into account in our foreign policy initiatives. Let us hope that the fund will generate precisely such ideas.

[Zholkver] Well, to bring our broadcast to a close, it must be said that the past 2 years have completely confirmed the correct and forward-looking nature of all the tenets expressed in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's 15 January statement. I would like to remind you that the statement ended on the following words: The policy of peace and disarmament has been and will be the core of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. Pursuing it vigorously, the Soviet Union is prepared for broad cooperation with all who act from the standpoint of reason, good will, and awareness of their responsibility for ensuring a future for mankind without wars and without weapons.

Thank you, colleagues, for taking part in this broadcast. Thank you, comrade listeners, for your attention.

TV Report on Reconciliation Movements

LD180030 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1340 GMT on 16 January 1988 carries a 50-minute program entitled "By the Hard Roads of Reconciliation", presented by Political Observer Igor Fesunenko and with the participation of Mikhail Stepanovich Kapitsa and Viktor Vatslavovich Volskiy, USSR Academy of Sciences candidate members, dealing with the situation in Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Nicaragua. As the unidentified narrator says at the beginning of the program, "Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Nicaragua are three of the world's flashpoints, three areas where, in recent years, shots have been ringing out, bombs have exploded, the flames of conflagrations have blazed, and tens of thousands of people have become the victims of undeclared wars". The narrator's remarks are accompanied by brief clips showing scenes of devastation in each of those countries.

After this opening sequence, Fesunenko describes the purpose of the program in the folliwng terms:

"Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Nicaragua are three of the world's flashpoints, three sources of grief and tears, struggle and hope on which the solidarity, sympathy and attention of ordinary people throughout the world are riveted. But has the time not come for putting an end to the cruel blood-letting and exchanging swords for plowshares? Our program will deal with precisely that—the policy of national reconciliation in those countries. It will consist of various components. The most important of them will be contributions from the leaders of those three countries." He explains that the program will also include excerpts from films about those countries.

The first topic is Afghanistan.

Kapitsa provides the following commentary to a piece of film said to show on Afghan rebel camp in a frontier area. According to a caption the film dates from October 1987.

"A revolution took place in Afghanistan in April 1978. It was not a socialist revolution; it was an anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, democratic revolution. In actual fact, a war began to be conducted against Afghanistan. The tragedy is that several million people have fled from Afghanistan. Most of them have gone to Pakistan. Camps were set up there with the help of the Pakistani authorities and, in Iran, with the help of the Iranian authorities. With the help of foreign instructors, fighting units—bandit units—began to be trained, which, initially, carried out quite extensive military operations, crossing the border and intruding into [words indistinct]. But, as resistance on the part of the people's army increased, they began to resort more frequently to sabotage and terror."

There follows a sequence from a film showing a rebel convoy carrying arms across the mountainous Pakistani-Afghan border country. An unidentified person talks to the damage caused by rebel mines, which he says severely disrupted traditional trade practices. Fesunenko explains that the film, "Afghan diary", was shot by Aleksandr Kaverznev in Afghanistan in 1983, "when our servicemen had been there for over 3 years." He calls on Kapitsa to say why they were there. Kapitsa says:

"The situation was complicated by the fact that, during the revolution, a fierce struggle had been going on in the Afghan leadership itself. In 1978, President Taraki was in the Soviet Union. He signed a treaty of friendship, good-neighborliness and cooperation. But shortly after he had returned, he was killed by one of his assistants, Amin, who set up a hardline—I would even say, terroristic—regime in the country. The struggle in the party grew more intense. The implementation of a number of reforms which were of a blatantly adventurist and ultra-left nature began. After the overthrow of Amin by the healthy forces of the Afghan revolution and the Afghan authorities to send in Soviet units to help defend the revolution. Such acts are very widespread in international relations. Any state has the right to invite a neighboring state to help it to defend its sovereignty or its independence, to suppress any internal subversive forces or to repel foreign aggression. So that was natural."

A film sequence follows, purporting to show examples of bandit "terror" in Afghanistan. Moscow television correspondent Mikhail Leshchinskiy reports on the war in the air, about the rebels' use of Western-supplied Stingers to bring down passenger aircraft. A former rebel talks about his training by U.S. instructors in Pakistan; the film shows the wreckage of a plane shot down near Gonduz by a Stinger missile.

Fesunenko says: "Arguing theoretically, one could respond to this bandit terror by using merciless and pitiless revolutionary terror. But is it worth pouring oil on the fire of a war now in its 9th year?"

The program section on Afghanistan continues with an interview with President Najibullah conducted by correspondent Leshchinskiy. Najibullah, speaking in vernacular with a superimposed Russian translation, discusses the policy of national reconciliation. The interview, date and place not given, reads as follows:

[Leshchinskiy] "Esteemed president, we have seen a year of active implementation of the policy of national reconciliation in Afghanistan. You know, I very well remember that January day, 15 January, when the unilateral cease-fire came into effect, when the troops returned to the places where they are permanently stationed, and the guns were covered over. Even then, you produced the phrase that maybe, at some time, the Afghan people would turn that day, 15 January, into a festival, a national peace day. So—a year has gone by. What has happened in that time? What has it been possible to do, and what has not been done?

[Najibullah] "The main thing is that national reconciliation has become a reality in our lives during that time. This has to be taken into account by all political forces, both inside our country and abroad. Hundreds and thousands of villages protected against destruction, tens of thousands of compatriots' lives saved, new enterprises, rebuilt houses, mosques, irrigation canals, schools—such are the first fruits of national reconciliation. From the vantage-point of accumulated experience, we can today see better that the implementation of the new policy has turned out to be a more difficult matter than it seemed previously. With every passing day, more and more Afghans are starting to speak to each other with the language of peace. The unilateral cease-fire and the major compromises and concessions have shown to the whole world the readiness of people's rule to begin a peace dialogue with the opposition.

[Leshchinskiy] "You were just talking about what has been done by people's rule in Afghanistan. But then national reconciliation is not, as the phrase has it, a one-way street. What is the mood of the opposition, and how are its affairs going?

[Najibullah] "The Afghan leadership seeks a dialogue with the opposition. To those who have no interest in a political settlement and who frustrate it in debates about the timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet troops I will say plainly: The problem of Afghanistan is not a problem of the presence of Soviet troops. We are profoundly grateful to our Soviet friends for the help they have provided by sending internationalist servicemen to Afghanistan. Prompted by the sincere wish to speed up their return to the homeland, we took the decision, discussed with the Soviet side, to carry it out in not more than 12 months, and maybe even less—provided, of course, that there is an end to the interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

[Leshchinskiy] "Esteemed president, Afghanistan can, in a way, be regarded as a pioneer in the political settlement of regional conflicts.

[Najibullah] "Our people lay no claim to originality. This policy has now become a definitive tendency for most of the countries that are striving for revolutionary transformation and independence. Great successes have been achieved by our Nicaraguan comrades and by the countries of Latin America as a whole. A very interesting specific program has been drawn up in Kampuchea under the leadership of Comrade Heng Samrin. Thus, the policy of national reconciliation has become part of the life of the world community, and we wish everyone success in attaining these noble goals."

The next portion of the program concerns Nicaragua. This opens with an excerpt from Fesunenko's film entitled "Nicaragua—Resolve for Victory", made in 1983. The film shows soldiers on guard at a border post in northern Nicaragua and a fuel depot on fire at Porto Corinto, said to be as a result of Contra Sabotage.

Fesunenko says little has changed in Nicaragua since the film was made, except the scale of U.S. help for the contras and the ferocity of the war they have been waging. Volskiy then talks about how a genuine people's revolution took place in Nicaragua in july 1979, over a film clip showing cheering crowds. Volskiy notes that without U.S. support the contras could not continue, as they have no popular support. Fesunenko adds:

"With an overwhelming military advantage, and not giving the contras the opportunity to gain even a small victory on small sectors of the front—this front without a frontline—the Nicaraguan Government has displayed the maximum of goodwill and decided to sign an agreement in Guatemala on a peace settlement in Central America. Nicaraguan President Comrade Daniel Ortega, talks about how it is being implemented, in a special interview for our program."

Ortega speaks to an unidentified correspondent in Spanish with a superimposed Russian translation in the interview, which reads as follows:

[Ortega] "I can assert that Nicaragua is ahead of the other Central American countries in implementing the Guatemala agreement. The National Council for reconciliation has been formed, under the chairmanship of Cardinal Obando y Bravo. The opposition has been invited to a dialogue. It can express its point of view, and the government is prepared to hear it out and take notice of what it considers constructive in the framework of constitutional order.

The line for a cease-fire is being followed firmly. Cardinal Obando y Bravo has become the intermediary with the U.S. Government, which uses the contras as a weapon of aggression against Nicaragua. The first round of talks has already been held in the Dominican Republic, and another meeting is planned to be held there to continue discussions of the cease-fire question, with the cardinal as intermediary.

"However, these peace efforts are being torpedoed by the United States, which is acting counter to the Guatemala agreement. In particular, they are following a course in Nicaragua of using the political space that has opened up following the Guatemala accord to implement a so-called plan for the Chilification of Nicaragua, that is, destabilization of the internal situation in the country. The United States uses to this end the opposition parties, the organs of the rightwing press and other pro-imperialist groups. Since the mercenaries are not able to smash the Nicaraguan revolution, attempts are being made to stir up popular discontent through the activities of opposition groups and the press organs which represent the interests of the employers. Success of the plan for the Chilification of Nicaragua, plus the actions of the mercenaries, would create favorable conditions for invasion by U.S. troops."

There follows a video report by Yuriy Baranov on the right-wing representatives' walkout from talks on constitutional amendments. Cardinal Obando y Bravo is interviewed briefly on his desire for peace, truth, justice and liberty. Baranov visits LA PRENSA, after showing the covers being taken off the presses and printing operations in progress however, despite their "fine words" about freedom of speech, Baranov says, the paper's publishers declined to talk to Soviet Television. Baranov gives the flavor of LA PRENSA by talking about two front-page stories, holding up the issue of 7 December 1987; one is about opposition demands for a new government—the opposition being an employers' organization which had a meeting in Caracas, he explains, the other calls the contras who attacked a village "rebel forces". The video report ends with scenes of devastation caused in a village by a contra attack, received, according to the caption, on 22 December.

The Cambodian portion of the program opens with clip from a film made by A. Kaverznev shortly after the overthrow of Pol Pot, illustrating the achievements of the peasantry. A clip from another film by Kaverznev shows a shepherd talking about the massacres carried out under Pol Pot. Fesunenko says:

"Following the principles of the new political thinking, the leadership of the PRK, at the same time as the Governments of Afghanistan and Nicaragua, put forward a program of peaceful settlement and national reconciliation, which has already begun to be implemented, as related in an interview for our program by Comrade Heng Samrin."

Heng Samrin, speaking in vernacular with a superimposed Russian translation, says the following: "As of this time, important events connected with the situation in and around the PRK have occurred. The first important event was another withdrawal at the end of November of a significant part of the Vietnamese volunteer troops from Kampuchea. We decided on this step, the biggest in recent years, taking into account the common aspiration of our countries for the speediest peaceful settlement of the Cambodian problem, in the spirit of the conference of top leaders of Kampuchea, Vietnam, and Laos which was held in Vientiane in 1983. You also know about the second important event. Our party decided to start meetings between Hun Sen, PRK Council of Ministers chairman, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk. The first was held in Paris 2-4 December last year. This is a practical implementation of our national reconciliation policy. The solution of the complex Cambodian problem can be achieved only by way of talks, and in this a lot depends on the goodwill of the sides."

Next, correspondent Yevgeniy Kochanov reports from a Cambodian center for refugees who want to return home, interviewing a local official on the success of the campaign.

Fesunenko notes that the success of the first steps of national reconciliation in the three countries featured above is a sign of the implementation of new thinking in political affairs. But the policy requires goodwill from the other side as well; such goodwill was evident in the Washington summit, he says, three brief video clips finally show Ortega praising the summit's contribution to disarmament, which will have an effect on settling regional disputes, Najibullah praising the policy of national reconciliation, and Heng Samrin saying that a peaceful Kampuchea will help make a peaceful South-East Asia and a peaceful world.

Gremitskikh Denies Planes Downed Near Khowst

LD151539 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today refuted allegations by the BBC and the Voice of America, which have reported, citing a representative of the Afghan anti-government Hezb-Eeslami [Islamic Party of Afghanistan] group in Pakistan, that the Afghan anti-government forces have shot down and taken prisoner three Soviet pilots in the area of Khowst.

The radio services later even identified the pilots as Colonel Romanov, Major Sholov and Captain Andropov.

"According to the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR," Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh said at a briefing, "there was not a single Afghan or Soviet plane downed in the area of the city of Khowst at the time and so not a single pilot was taken prisoner".

Kashlev on Human Rights Conferences Venues

LD181452 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1412 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jan (TASS)—"Our proposal to hold an international conferences on humanitarian cooperation and human rights in Moscow, which was put forward by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze at the opening of the Vienna meeting in 1986, remains on the negotiating table in Vienna," ambassador-at-large Yuriy Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation to the third meeting of representatives of the CSCE participant states in Vienna, said at a briefing today in the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry. "The Soviet Union will continue to stand by this proposal."

"Over a fairly lengthy period Western countries, mainly NATO members, have failed to adopt a stance on this question, whereas the socialist countries and the neutral countries of Europe in their majority have supported the proposal," Yuriy Kashkev said. "More and more NATO countries are now also generally expressing more or less favorable views regarding the convening of such a conference. Unfortunately, the United States is adopting the most indeterminate stance."

"It is important to be aware of the fact that in submitting the proposal to convene an international conference in Moscow on humanitarian cooperation and human rights, the ambassador-at-large said, the Soviet Union by no means intends to be under the thumb of the Western countries and to turn it into a place where only emigration problems will be discussed. This is one of the numerous problems which are on the agenda of the Vienna negotiations."

In response to a journalist's question, Yuriy Kashlev reported that a parallel idea has recently emerged—France's proposal for holding a conference on approximately the same topics in Paris in 1989. "If these two events take place they should not be in competition but should supplement one another," Yuriy Kashlev said. "We are quite in favor of France's Idea—there are no reasons such an event should not be held in France in the anniversary year of the French revolution. But it is important that the conferences in Moscow and Paris should not be in competition but should supplement one another."

Comments on Vienna Talks

LD181925 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—By a TASS diplomatic correspondent:

"Western countries are seeking to make the Vienna followup meeting a hostage of the 'Third Basket' (cooperation in the humanitarian field), with the talks skidding and slowing down as a result," the leader of the Soviet delegation to the meeting, Yuriy Kashlev, told a briefing at the press center of the Soviet Foreign Ministry today.

The ambassador-at-large was commenting on the results of the third round of that review forum attended by representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

"Many Western delegations say bluntly that they are not going to come to terms on the 'First Basket' (the problems of security in Europe) and the 'Second Basket' (cooperation in economic, scientific and technological areas and environmental protection) until they hammer out what they need in the 'Third Basket'.

"In the meantime, the range of issues discussed in Vienna is exceptionally wide and their resolution is extremely important to the Helsinki process developing positively," Kashlev said.

"The Vienna meeting can end at an optimistic note, with a final document and agreed paneuropean activities to be staged after Vienna.

"In the military field, this includes continued talks within the framework of the Stockholm conference on confidence-and-security-building measures in Europe and a new set of negotiations on conventional weapons and armed forces from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains, plus a host of other major paneuropean events in the other 'baskets'," the Soviet diplomat continued.

"But there is a real threat of a pessimistic outcome of the meeting, in which case it will end with a mere communique, as has been the case at Belgrade. This can happen, in particular, due to the lack of essential understandings in the military and humanitarian fields," he said.

"The focus is on very serious matters: The Soviet Union has suggested discussing at the future negotiations on conventional weapons and armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals cuts in the armed forces and conventional weapons, including such a dangerous variety as dual-purpose systems.

"This comprises tactical nuclear arms—planes, missiles and artillery capable of firing either conventional or nuclear shells.

"We strongly demand that such arms be subject to the reductions to be agreed in the course of the future negotiations. The NATO countries have so far been digging their heels in and saying they are not prepared to discuss the issue.

"We find this posturing absolutely illogical: There is no sense in reducing fire-arms, while not touching the main, the most dangerous weapons which can be armed with either conventional or nuclear munitions.

"This is a deception of the European nations, this is a fakery," Kashlev said.

"As far as the humanitarian field is concerned, some Western countries have been making obviously maximalist and unrealistic proposals which simply cannot be accepted.

"Just imagine: They propose, for example, completely abolishing the system of visas for travel from one country to another or limiting the term during which permission to foreign travel can be denied to people with knowledge of secrets to just one year, which is at odds with the practice adopted in the vast majority of countries," Kashlev went on to say.

"Nonetheless, we hope that it will be possible to avoid the pessimistic variant of the Vienna meeting's conclusion as the overwhelming majority of European nations—including both neutral ones and NATO members, not to mention the socialist countries which have been strongly pressing for real steps to ensure security in Europe—have been demonstrating an interest in the progress of the CSCE process," the leader of the Soviet delegation to the Vienna meeting said.

Some newsmen representing NATO countries pelted ambassador-at-large Kashlev and Vladimir Morozov, a deputy chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, with numerous questions concerning the problem of emigration from the USSR.

Those reporters were told once again that a total of 33,000 people, including children, left the Soviet Union in 1987, which was some seven times more than in 1986. Those people were Germans, Jews, Armenians, Greeks and members of other nationalities.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev Meets Hammer on INF, Afghanistan

LD151909 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev had a meeting in the Kremlin today with Dr. Armand Hammer, a prominent U.S. industrialist and public figure who is chairman of the board of Oxidental Petroleum Corporation.

Gorbachev pointed out Hammer's big personal contribution to maintaining and consolidating the Soviet-U.S. relationship and his efforts for many years to promote cooperation and improve mutual understanding between the Soviet and American people.

Hammer spoke highly of the INF (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force) Treaty signed in Washington last December, calling it a right step in the right direction. He pointed to the Soviet leadership's big contribution to resolving that issue and wished success to Soviet-U.S. talks on strategic offensive arms reduction.

Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet Union had been and would continue doing everything in its power to secure cuts in nuclear armories and an end to the arms race in also other areas. "Naturally enough, we expect reciprocal efforts from the U.S. Government as well," he said.

Hammer raised the issue of a settlement regarding Afghanistan. Referring to certain circles in the U.S. Administration, he asserted that they were waiting for more proof of the Soviet Union's good will in the issue.

Gorbachev recalled that at the Washington meeting the Soviet delegation had made serious and constructive proposals, but "we haven't yet received an adequate response from the administration, and that's a pity since such a settlement could set an example of a new approach to resolving other regional problems.

"Our position on this score remains clear-cut. We are for the earliest possible resolution of the problem. Of course, the issues of the troops withdrawal should be linked with an end to outside interference in Afghan affairs," Gorbachev said.

Hammmer told him of plans to launch a joint venture in the Soviet Union with the involvement of U.S. and other firms.

Gorbachev said that developing broad and mutually beneficial cooperation met the interests of both countries and the Soviet Union welcomed it.

Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, also took part in the conversation, which passed in a warm atmosphere.

Dobrynin Receives Hammer

LD171504 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 17 TASS—Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has received Armand Hammer, prominent representative of the U.S. public and business circles, chairman of the board of Occidental Petroleum Corporation.

Hammer told about a profound impression made on him by the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and members of the board of directors of the recently created International Fund for the Survival and Development of Humanity. He pointed out that the ideas expressed by Gorbachev would induce influential representatives of the scientific, cultural and business circles to make their contribution to the quest for a solution to the more acute global problems that would lead to the creation of a safe world. The Soviet leader, he continued, is playing a remarkable part in the rallying of all the forces supporting this kind of the world.

Hammer said that he would soon turn 90. This is why he can discuss these matters on the basis of his considerable experience of life and his own participation in efforts aimed at the normalization of Soviet-American relations, which he has been doing all his long life.

Armand Hammer told about his practical steps in the sphere of trade and economic relations between the two countries, specifically, about the coordination with Soviet organizations of a plan to create in the USSR a big joint enterprise to produce plastics.

Dobrynin Receives U.S. Visitor Schneier

LD181505 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin has received Arthur Schneier, president of the Appeal to the Conscience Foundation (USA), at his request.

Schneier, who took part in the constituent session of the international fund for the survival and development of mankind in Moscow, said that support extended by Mikhail Gorbachev to the initiators of the fund would be a powerful impetus to launching the organization's activity within scientific, public and business communities in various countries.

During the conversation, the sides exchanged views on the role that the public in the Soviet Union and the United States could play in establishing a favourable climate for the constructive development of Soviet-American relations, above all in implementing new steps in the field of disarmament.

In this connection Schneier observed that religious circles in the United States which he represented had welcomed the results of the Gorbachev-Reagan meeting in Washington and the conclusion of the INF Treaty.

These circles were ready to give all possible assistance to achieving new agreements in the field of disarmament in order to avert the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

Gromyko Holds Meeting With Senator Biden

PM181713 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Reception in Kremlin"]

[Text] In the Kremlin 15 January A.A. Gromyko received the well-known U.S. Senator Joseph Biden, member of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is in Moscow at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The senator is also chairman of the Subcommittee for European Affairs and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The talks were devoted chiefly to the upcoming ratification of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The senator said that he had spent the past 2 weeks on a tour of a number of West European countries. The purpose of his talks and meetings with prominent politicians had been to personally learn the opinion of West Europe's leaders on the Soviet-U.S. treaty. He had met in Bonn with Chancellor H. Kohl, in Paris with President F. Mitterrand, in London with Prime Minister M. Thatcher, and in all three of those capitals with the foreign and defense ministers, as well as with other politicians and statesmen. In Belgium, where the NATO headquarters is situated, his interlocutors were representatives of practically all the European member countries of that bloc.

All the leaders of West European countries advocate the treaty's ratification. A duality is sensed in the United States itself: On the one hand there is a feeling of hope, and on the other skepticism and a certain mistrust of the Soviet Union. Certain conservative senators would like to set the tone during the discussion of the treaty and make certain amendments to it which would belittle the significance of the accords reached. They are also seeking to cast doubt on the need for subsequent talks on reducing strategic offensive arms.

However, according to the guest, the majority of senators are definitely optimistic. On 25 January this year the Congress will reassemble for its session after the latest vacation and begin discussing this treaty. On returning from his tour of West Europe and to the Soviet Union, the senator will be able, on the basis of contacts with representatives of the leadership of a number of countries, to pass on their opinion in favor of ratification.

A.A. Gromyko declared that the skepticism and mistrust which some people feel even today toward our country are quite unjustified. The Soviet Union is not making any wedges to force apart the NATO countries. This position is based on the 27th CPSU Congress decisions and the Soviet leaders' corresponding statements.

As a socialist state, the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the nuclear threat hanging over the world must be removed. It has emphasized many times that this threat exists to the whole world, to mankind, and to life on earth. And people's new thinking must proceed from this. How is the threat to be removed? The Soviet people and the Soviet leadership believe that this can be done best of all and most reliably of all by destroying nuclear weapons themselves.

The USSR and the United States fought side by side in World War II. Together with their allies they did everything to eliminate the threat of fascism. Now too these countries, together with other states, must do everything to remove the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The USSR and the United States must be ahead of others in achieving this goal. All other considerations must take a back seat. So far, unfortunately, not all politicians understand this. Some of them frequently try to resemble participants in sports competitions and try to gamble on winning. But it was long ago proved scientifically that there will be no champions in "nuclear competitions." Back in Geneva M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan had reached the conclusion that there can be no winners in a nuclear war. We would like those U.S. circles which make policy, as it is customary to say, to give serious thought to all this.

J. Biden pointed out that certain politicians in the West are of the opinion that peace cannot be preserved without nuclear weapons. And this, it is said, is borne out by the centuries-long history of Europe, which was constantly fighting without nuclear weapons. Even Germany, which has ended up without them, could try to obtain them quickly and threaten other countries once again.

In reply A.A. Gromyko demonstrated that it is necessary to create a reliable system of universal international security with strict observance of the principle of noninterference in states' internal affairs. No one must try to dictate his will to other countries or other peoples. Precisely this is one of the fundamental principles of the Soviet state's foreign policy.

The Soviet people believe in the success of the socialist social system. We believe that objective laws will lead to the elimination of man's exploitation by man in the world. But there are U.S. circles which try to impose their aims and to prove that the future belongs to the Western world. We believe that history itself will provide the answer to the question of who is right.

The idea that things would be worse if nuclear weapons were eliminated creeps into the arguments which you mentioned, A.A. Gromyko added. We do not believe this. We are confident that, if nuclear weapons were destroyed and all countries adhered to the principle of noninterference in other states' internal affairs, then security would be ensured in the world and there would be none of the wars which, to use your words, Senator, have shaken Europe in past centuries. If a system of all-embracing security were created, not only Europe but also Asia, Africa, America, and the whole world would live calmly under conditions of peace.

Now about Germany. You mentioned it as though a single Germany exists. And yet there are two of them: the GDR and the FRG. We are sure that the Germans in Europe cannot be considered a kind of island isolated from everyone. These two Germanies will be part of a nuclear-free Europe.

The chief task now is to ratify the treaty that has been signed. The Soviet leadership proceeds from the premise that the U.S. side too will act in this direction, fully aware of its high responsibility.

The significance of this treaty consists in the fact that, first, both countries are reducing their nuclear arsenal by a certain quantity and, second, the very fact of a reduction means that it is not only necessary but also possible to move further along this path. Therefore it is correct to evaluate the Soviet-U.S. treaty as an act of historic significance.

The Soviet Union would like to believe that the talks now taking place between our countries will also be crowned with success, and it expects the U.S. side to display a constructive approach to them. After the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty in Washington our relations have risen a step higher, as it were, and this must contribute to the holding of the present Soviet-U.S. talks on reducing strategic offensive arms.

You will be acting correctly if you go away understanding the Soviet people's confidence that they will achieve successes in restructuring. No one will be worse off because of the Soviet economy's successes. If only because new possibilities will be opened up in the sphere of trade and the exchange of material assets. Therefore all other countries must welcome our achievements in the transformations currently taking place.

J. Biden: Yes, as people say in America, our window is partly open now, and everything must be done to ensure that it does not slam shut: The Soviet-U.S. treaty must be ratified.

A.A. Gromyko: But I would say more. All the windows must be opened. It would not be a bad thing if we also set the doors ajar. And everything must be done to ensure that no wind slams them shut.

Present at the talks were N.F. Rubtsov, chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretariat; John Ritch, chief of the senator's secretariat; and Jack Foust Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR.

Petrovskiy Holds Discussions With Congressmen

LD162040 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, had a meeting today with a group of U.S. congressmen staying in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Parliamentary Group.

During their conversation they touched upon a wide range of questions connected with the state and prospects of Soviet-American relations and the world situation in general.

The Soviet side pointed out the all-time value of the recent summit meeting in Washington that had created necessary conditions for the improvement and steady constructive development of relations between the two countries. It was pointed out that the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles should serve as a powerful accelerator of progress in other major spheres of the curtailment of the arms race, and, in the first place, in a significant, by 50 percent, reduction of strategic offensive armaments along with the observance of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it had been signed in 1972. The concluding as soon as possible of an agreement banning chemical weapons, as well as practical results in the reduction of the armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals are also of much importance. Of course, a comprehensive security structure ensuring equal security for all cannot be created without simultaneous progress in the settlement of regional conflicts, the solution of humanitarian and other global problems.

On their part, American congressmen spoke out in favour of the development of relations and contacts between the two countries, of the consolidation of the encouraging processes started in this sphere.

During the conversation mutual conviction was voiced that in the coming especially responsible period persistent efforts would be required from both sides in order to realize to the full a positvie political impetus given by the epoch-making Washington meeting and to use to the maximum the opportunities created by its results for the Soviet-American and international relations.

Congressmen Meet Tolkunov

LD142036 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 14 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 14 TASS—A group of U.S. congressmen visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the parliamentary group of the USSR were received today at the Supreme Soviet (national parliament).

Speakers at the meeting stressed the historic significance of the Washington summit and the INF (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force) Treaty signed there.

Addressing the guests, members of the House Foreign Affairs Commission, Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, one of the two chambers in the Soviet parliament, pointed to the need for the two countries to continue working together to reduce the risk of outbreak of war and cut back strategic, conventional and other arms.

He said that the INF Treaty opened broad prospects for that and that strict compliance with the ABM Treaty and the prevention of an arms race in space were an important condition for successful further practical steps towards [passage indistinct].

China

Sitaryan Economic Delegation Visits Shanghai

OW150837 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 14 Jan 88

[Text] A Soviet delegation led by S.A. Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, visited Shanghai 10-13 January. Huang Ju, vice mayor of Shanghai, met with the delegation. The Soviet guests held discussions with officials of the Shanghai Municipal CPC Committee and the municipal Office for Restructuring the Economic System. They also visited Shanghai's industrial enterprises and the Maqiao Village in the suburbs.

The Soviet guests were in China for the first session of the working group of the Soviet-Chinese Committee for Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technical Cooperation held in Beijing. During a meeting with the leaders of the Soviet delegation, Chinese Vice Premier Tian Jiyun called for further development of Sino-Soviet economic cooperation and trade.

Delegation Returns

LD152158 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1739 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jan (TASS)—A delegation led by Stepan Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan, returned to Moscow from Beijing today. The delegation took part in the work of the first conference of the permanent working group of the Soviet-Chinese Commission for Economic, Trade, and Scientific-Technical Cooperation.

During his stay in the PRC, S. Sitaryan was received by Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and deputy premier of the PRC State Council, who stressed during the discussion that trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and the PRC have developed further over the past few years and that our countries have great potentials for expanding and intensifying it. In his words, despite the difference in conditions, the PRC and the USSR are tackling similar problems and could borrow specific positive experience from each other in the area of implementing reform.

Deputy Minister Bavrin Notes Increase in Trade

OW190005 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] During an interview with the reporters of this station, Soviet Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade Bavrin pointed out that the Soviet-Chinese trade volume this year increased by 28% and exceeded R1.8 billion. He pointed out that prospects for developing border trade between the Soviet Union and China are very good.

Heilongjiang Broadens Cooperation With USSR

LD171445 Moscow TASS in English 1318 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] Beijing January 17 TASS—TASS correspondent Oleg Mastryukov reports:

China's north-eastern province of Heilongjiang intends to broaden trade, economic and technical cooperation and develop other forms of business friendly [as received] relations with the Soviet Union. This was stated by Hou Jie, chairman of the People's Provincial Government, at the first session of the seventh assembly of people's representatives of the Heilongjiang Province.

Over the past five years, he said, border trade of the Heilongjiang Province with the USSR amounted to 150 Swiss francs with 21.6 per cent average annual increment.

Trade and economic organizations of the province are satisfied with the broadening cooperation. There are vast reserves for faster development of mutually beneficial business relations, the Chinese side believes. The province has certain experience in contract construction of projects for foreign countries, in providing labour services, establishing mixed companies on the basis of China's and foreign firms' facilities.

Border Firms Begin Trade Talks in Moscow

OW190017 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] The Far East-Xinjiang Import and Export Trading Company of the Soviet Union and the Import and Export Company of China's Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region have begun talks in Moscow. They are discussing how to further promote trade on the Soviet-Chinese border. The Kazakh SSR and other republics restored border trade with the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region in 1986. To date, the two sides have held export commodities fairs in Alma-Ata and Urumqi and signed two important trade contracts. During the Moscow talks, it is expected that a new import-export agreement will be signed.

(He Ximu), head of the Chinese Xinjiang trade delegation, told the reporters of this station: A good foundation has been laid for the Soviet-Chinese border trade. With the improvement of Sino-Soviet relations, the border trade will be further promoted. This is precisely what the people of the two countries want.

USSR Publishes Collection of Deng Speeches

PM181015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 First Edition p 4

[A. Ivanov report and book review: "Along the Path of Renewal. Anthology of Deng Xiaoping's Works"]

[Text] 15 Jan—The USSR Political Literature Publishing House has published an anthology of works by Deng Xiaoping, eminent PRC party and state figure, under the title "Basic Questions of Modern China" [Osnovnyye Voprosy Sovremennogo Kitaya]. The anthology includes more than 40 pronouncements by the author in the most important problems of the country's domestic life and foreign policy over the last few years.

The anthology was launched in public today at the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade. M. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, and A. Polyakov, director of the Political Literature Publishing House, spoke at the ceremony. Confidence was expressed that the publication of Deng Xiaoping's book in the Soviet Union will help the public in our country to gain fuller knowledge of China's experience in socialist modernization. PRC ambassador to the USSR Yu Hongliang spoke at the launch of the anthology.

[Book review begins] A process of reforms in the economy and other spheres of social life has been spreading in the PRC since 1979 with the objective of more fully revealing the potential of socialism and accelerating modernization in virtually all spheres of life. The 13th CPC Congress, held in the fall of last year, described the past decade as "a new period in the history of the country's development which has profoundly changed its entire appearance." Even though many pressing problems in the PRC are still awaiting solution, the results of the last 9 years speak for themselves.

Key indicators of the development of the economy and of the people's prosperity were successfully doubled in that time. Dynamism and renewal are the basic results of the policy of comprehensive reforms and expansion of external ties pursued by China in the eighties. As delegates to the party congress noted, the "chief architect" of this course which has proved its correctness is Deng Xiaoping, veteran of the Chinese Revolution and leading political figure of the PRC.

Deng Xiaoping's speeches and his statements in conversations with foreign representatives, which are included in the book, are far removed from ostentation and diplomatic smooth talk. The author conducts a blunt conversation on the difficult problems of a state with a population of 1 billion and reflects on the tasks of the reform of the political and economic system without concealing his concern over the difficulties arising along the way of solving these tasks. In a large country like China, Deng Xiaoping says, we are accomplishing deeds which were unknown to our predecessors. When implementing reforms, he believes, one must not hesitate or halt halfway, afraid of making mistakes. At the same time, it is necessary to display circumspection on specific issues and sum up the accumulated experience.

Noting the achievements of the last few years, Deng Xiaoping expresses confidence in the correctness of the chosen path. I am in favor of reform, he says, because without reform there is no way out of the situation. The book emphasizes that the course of reviving the economy and expanding ties with the outside world on which the country has embarked is a stable and long-term policy which will not change in the next 50-70 years. After that time, toward the middle of the next century, China will have—in the author's opinion—drawn close to the level of the world's developed countries. This is a strategic program which cannot be fulfilled without the implementation of reforms.

The book clearly affirms loyalty to Marxist ideology and the socialist path of development. The theory of Marxism, the author points out, demands that answers to new questions are found in the light of its basic principles and methods in conjunction with constantly changing reality. Was this not the way, he asks, that the October Revolution in Russia and our own revolution in China achieved victory? A different epoch and different tasks only make it more imperative to master the basic tenets of Marxism as applied to new reality.

Chinese foreign policy, Deng Xiaoping notes, is based on the principles of autonomy and independence, of genuine nonalignment. Its main avenue is the struggle for peace all over the world.

The anthology includes statements by Deng Xiaoping in conversations with leaders from several socialist countries who visited the PRC in 1986-1987. It is noted that, despite all the differences in the situation and methods of building, China and these countries share a single common goal—the consolidation of socialism in deed.

The new meaningful book on China's problems will be greeted with interest by Soviet readers.

Northeast Asia

DPRK Denies Complicity in Nov 87 KAL Incident

PM181705 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "KCNA Statement"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 16 Jan—The DPRK is not involved in the incident of the South Korean aircraft and resolutely condemns attempts by the Seoul authorities to implicate it for the disappearance of this airliner in November 1987, says a KCNA statement published here today. The document points out that the results of the investigation into this incident announced today in Seoul are "false from start to finish, full of lies and contradictions."

The South Korean side, KCNA points out, was simply unable to submit any material evidence to substantiate their accusations, notably the "black box" from the missing airliner.

It is a question of a carefully planned, premeditated anti-DPRK action designed to distract attention from the North's new peace initiatives aimed at eliminating confrontation, achieving national accord, and easing tension in Korea. The fact that the announcement of the investigation results coincided with the DPRK's submission of its proposal to convene a joint North-South conference to resolve these problems illustrates that Seoul is not even contemplating dialogue and peace but is seeking confrontation and a buildup in tension on the Korean peninsula. Current events in Seoul, including the convening of an emergency session of the Committee of the Armed Forces' Chiefs of Staff, cannot be seen as anything other than the overt proclamation of a course of confrontation with the DPRK.

The rulers of South Korea will bear the entire responsibility for the consequences of the anticommunist clamor hostile to the DPRK which they have unleashed, the KCNA statement stresses.

ROK on Alert

LD151630 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] The South Korean authorities have put the Armed Forces on heightened alert. At the same time the defense minister of the Seoul regime, Chong Ho-Yong, came out with threats against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The pretext for that was the so-called exposures made by a woman passenger of a South Korean airliner which crashed near the Burma-Thailand border on 29 November last year. She claimed that she was assigned by the authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to place a bomb in the plane before leaving it in Abu Dhabi where it landed for a short while. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea categorically rejected the charge of being involved in the disaster.

The Japanese weekly SHUKAN SHINCHO wrote recently that the South Korean authorities themselves have had a hand in preparing the explosion on the airliner. Among other things, this is borne out by the fact that 11 South Korean officials and two guardsmen responsible for the safety of the flight secretly abandoned the plane in Abu Dhabi.

DPRK Declines Invitation to Summer Games

PM140915 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "DPRK National Olympic Committee Statement"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 12 Jan—The DPRK National Olympic Committee has announced its decision not to take part in the 24th Olympic Games if they are held solely in South Korea. A statement published here says that the DPRK's sincere efforts to hold the 1988 Games jointly in the north and south of Korea have not produced results because of the position of the South Korean side, which has been seeking to hold the Games solely in the South.

In the circumstances, the document—published in connection with the approach of 17 January, the last date for giving notification of participation in the games—points out that the North has no chance of sending such notification.

Guided by the desire to achieve national reconciliation, the DPRK National Olympic Committee will continue to exert all efforts for the joint organization of the Olympics. The statement expresses the hope that an accord could be achieved on this at a joint meeting of North and South, which Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee and president of the DPRK, suggested could be held this year in his New Year speech. Then, the statement indicates, the DPRK could review its position on the 1988 Summer Games.

Potapov Comments on Takeshita's U.S. Visit

OW190249 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Potapov, our correspondent in Tokyo, has filed the following report on Japanese Prime Minister Takeshita's visit to the United States:

Let me first point out that this is Prime Minister Takeshita's first visit to the United States in his capacity as prime minister. In Washington, he is scheduled to hold talks with President Reagan, Secretary of State Shultz, the speakers of both houses of the U.S. Congress, and others. The Japanese mass media hold that this will be the starting point of Japan-U.S. relations in 1988.

According to Japanese papers, Takeshita and Reagan will discuss international issues and various problems in bilateral relations, particularly the serious trade friction between the two countries. Commentators have pointed out that Prime Minister Takeshita's visit to the United States comes at a juncture filled with difficulties.

Despite Japanese officials' repeated pledges to correct the trade imbalance, the U.S. trade deficit with Japan reached $60 billion in 1987. Indignant over this huge trade imbalance, Washington has continuously imposed pressure on Japan by demanding removal of tarriff barriers, liberalization of Japan's import of U.S. products, including agricultural produce, and U.S. enterprises' participation in bidding for major construction projects with state funds. Meanwhile, the U.S. Congress has recently taken action to prohibit Japanese construction companies from bidding for public works projects in the United States. With the yen's appreciation and the dollar's sharp depreciation, confusion in the financial field has also become very serious. The dollar has reportedly fallen to the record low exchange rate of 1 dollar against about 120 yen.

According to Prime Minister Takeshita, he does not intend to bring up the issues concerning trade and economic frictions at the talks. He plans to leave them for the experts to discuss. Commentators regard Takeshita's strategy as seeking U.S. consent by indicating Japan's position of agreeing to its major demands.

As a certain commentator has clearly pointed out, Prime Minister Takeshita has followed former Prime Minister Nakasone in pursuing diplomacy with presents and this time he is taking with him as a present the draft military budget for the fiscal 1988 that exceeds 1% of the GNP. Furthermore, Japan has also decided to increase its share of the maintenance costs for the U.S. forces in Japan. With such considerations given to the United States, the Japanese Government is attempting to avoid U.S. criticism of Japan.

Japanese Diplomatic Activities Reported

OW171335 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 12 Jan 88

[From the "World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] Japanese leaders have started the new year very actively. Consultations are being held in Tokyo between the foreign ministers of this Land of the Rising Sun and the United Kingdom. The main attention in these consultations is on international problems, in particular, on the relations between East and West.

Noboru Takeshita, prime minister of Japan, also left for a foreign tour today. He will be visiting the United States and Canada.

The heads of Japan and the United States will discuss global questions of international life and, of course, bilateral Japanese-U.S. relations. These relations are now going through a period which can hardly be called the best.

First, take for example the trade and economic sphere. The dollar has been falling. The exchange markets are feverish. You can see how the Tokyo Stock Exchange looks these days. Washington continues to strive for favorable terms for the penetration of U.S. goods into Japan and, at the same time, demands that Japanese manufacturers stop their mass offensive. In other words, there are quite a number of problems and contradictions, and it is doubtful that they will all be solved in a single Takeshita visit.

These two largest capitalist countries, however, seem to be finding an increasingly common language in the military sphere. The Japanese prime minister has stated before that he intends to increase appropriations for the maintainance of the U.S. armed forces stationed in Japan. Appropriations for this purpose in the next fiscal year will be increased 10%, as compared with this year.

There is another side to this question, which they intentionally try to conceal. The Pentagon has persistently strived to gain access to Japan's scientific and technological achievements. Today, a team of U.S. Department of Defense experts arrived in Tokyo. They plan to visit Japan's largest enterprises and scientific and research centers, those that are conducting various kinds of research in the field of electrical technology. In other words, there is a goal-oriented search for contemporary technology which can be used for a military purpose, for the development of radically new kinds of arms. According to information, this search aims at the development of exotic inventions, such as of pilotless aircraft, nonpenetrable tank armor, and the most modern means of space communication.

Gorbachev Book Presented at MPR Foreign Ministry

LD151927 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 15 January (TASS)—An official presentation of the book by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "Restructuring and and New Thinking for Our Country and the Whole World" published in Mongolian was held in the MPR Ministry of Foreign Affairs today.

Speaking to those present, T.S. Balhaajav, MPRP Central Committee secretary, said: "We, Mongolian Communists, have always learned and are learning from the CPSU's rich experience. We consider the book by M.S. Gorbachev a valuable work in the area of creative renewal and refinement of socialism, and in the development of a radical program of struggle for mankind to enter a nonnuclear and nonviolent 21st century."

This book raises legitimate interest and great satisfaction among Mongolian readers because, by reading it in their native language, they will be gaining deeper knowledge of the truly revolutionary process of restructuring in the USSR, its complexities, the crucial and unique nature of our times, the essence of the new political thinking, and the philosophy of the CPSU and the Soviet state in their foreign politics.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Describes Relations With Indochina

LD141502 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0435 GMT 14 Jan 88

[Interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev by Moscow radio correspondent Andrey Sestnev; recorded—date, place not given]

[Text] [Sestnev] Igor Alekseyevich, could you tell us please how relations are developing between the USSR and the countries of Indochina—with Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—in various spheres.

[Rogachev] The subject you raise is such that I can give a brief answer to your question only if I speak in general terms. Our cooperation with Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia covers practically all walks of life and work without exception. The core of our cooperation is, of course, close interaction between our fraternal parties, and above all regular meetings between the leaders of the CPSU and of the ruling parties of the countries of Indochina. Here is the latest example. At the end of December Viktor Mikhaylovich Chebrikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and KGB chairman, visited Vietnam and Laos.

Our cooperation in international affairs is strengthening and becoming more multifaceted. We have established a working mechanism of comradely consultations between the leaders of the Foreign Ministries of the four countries. The Soviet Union is in solidarity with the line of the three fraternal Indochinese states aimed at establishing good-neighborly relations with neighboring countries of Southeast Asia and at making this region a zone of peace, friendship, and cooperation. Undoubtedly every Indochinese country has its own specific characteristics. Therefore, it is not by any means a stereotyped approach that we use in forming our relations with them.

Well, I think it is clear that our relations with Vietnam are the most capacious and intensive. The decisions of the last few congresses of the SRV Communist Party state that friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union is a cornerstone in Vietnamese foreign relations. The friendship and cooperation treaty is operating effectively between our countries. We will be celebrating the 10th anniversary of this treaty this year. I think many hundreds and even thousands of listeners have been to Vietnam at various times to render selfless assistance to its people. I do not wish to go into too much detail. I will cite some of the most indicative figures.

As of today over 250 economic enterprises have been built in the fraternal republic with our help and technical assistance. The trade turnover between our countries reached R1.3 billion last year. Now about Laos. Our views and those of our Lao comrades are in complete unity on all ideological, international, and other matters. Our Lao friends note that over 50% of all foreign help rendered to their country is Soviet help. This help has given and is giving them an opportunity to strengthen the people's political system, to develop the state sector, and to successfully fulfill the task of restructuring in the republic while leaning on the first gains of the socialist society.

What can we say about our relations with the People's Republic of Kampuchea? The nature of these relations is being affected by that complex situation in which the country found itself as the outcome of the Pol Pot regime. It was in 1979 that I first went to this country, in other words right after the liberation of Cambodia from the Pol Pot people. We saw a devastated Phnom Penh and deserted villages. You could not see a soul or domestic animals or any smoking chimneys. This was a horrifying sight. Now Cambodia is in the process of reconstruction. The Soviet Union has been helping this country so that it can rebuild its economy and adjust its educational system as well as its cultural life. We are supporting the efforts of the republican government aimed at attaining national reconciliation and solving all problems by political means—at the negotiation table.

The dialogue that has begun between Comrade Hun Sen, the head of the PRK Government, and Prince Sihanouk is an important step on the way toward unblocking the conflict around Cambodia. The first meeting between them took place in Paris. The second meeting will also probably be held there. There is reason to suppose these talks will lead to attaining agreement between all the sides involved in the conflict.

[Sestnev] What are the prospects, in your view, for the development of the USSR's relations with the region's countries.

[Rogachev] First of all, I would like to say we are trying in a joint effort to create still more effective forms of cooperation. This particularly concerns economic relations. This also determines the way we define our long-term tasks. Last year Comrade Nguyen Van Lin, SRV Communist Party Central Committee general secretary, visited Moscow. His visit has become an important milestone in the history of Soviet-Vietnamese relations. A new conception of bilateral trade, economic, and technological cooperation which meets the demands of modern conditions was developed.

Even now a transfer to new forms such as the setting up of joint enterprises and development of cooperation and direct trade economic relations is being implemented. Trade and economic cooperation with the Indochinese countries is more and more changing over to mutually beneficial principles. For example, the amount and choice of the goods we need and with which the three countries supply us with is increasing. There are great opportunities, for example, for the residents of the Soviet Far East to benefit from Vietnamese vegetables and fruit.

Restructuring in our own country, and the policy aimed at the renewal of all walks of life in Vietnam and Laos, and the positive processes that have been developing in Cambodia create favorable conditions for bringing our relations to a qualitatively new level.

Now a few words about our interaction in the international arena. We are aspiring—and this aspiration is true for both our countries—to strengthen coordination in our joint actions with the Indochinese countries in the name of the struggle for peace, disarmament, in the name of ensuring security and creating multifaceted cooperation in the Asian-South Pacific ocean region.

We can say with confidence that relations between the USSR and Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—the countries which are reliably leaning on their ideological and political unity and common causes—will be steadily getting stronger, richer, and better.

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev Sends Reply to PLO's 'Arafat

LD161518 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, has sent a message to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in connection with the situation on the occupied Arab territories and the continuing Israeli repressions against the Palestinians.

Comrade Gorbachev's message of reply notes that there can be no stable peace on earth as long as regional conflicts and hotbeds of tension exist and as long as the banking on of force and the ignoring of the elementary norms of international law have primacy in the policies of individual countries toward other peoples and states.

The Soviet Union condemns the unlawful actions of Tel Aviv, which is continuing its campaign of terror and repressions against the Palestinian population. The violent measures that the Israeli authorities are using against the Palestinians, who are coming out in defense of their rights, arouse anger and indignation in the Soviet people, just as in all people of goodwill.

The message expresses solidarity with the Palestinians, and stresses that each people is free to choose its own path of developmetn and to take charge of its own desiny. One must not ensure one's own rights and security by flouting the rights of others. The arbitrary rule exercised by Israel on the occupied Arab lands merely intensifies the feelings of mutual mistrust and enmity.

The resistance to Israeli occupation by the population of the West Bank and Gaza confirms the pressing need for the earliest settling of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The events taking place are yet further evidence of the unalterable fact that without a just solution of the Palestinian problem and the securing of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinians, the establishment of durable peace and stability in the Near East cannot be counted on.

Comrade Gorbachev's message expresses the conviction that the main avenue towards attainment of these goals lies in an international conference on the Near East, enjoying full powers and with the participation of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, and all the interested parties, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. It stresses that the Soviet Union intends to continue actively and constructively acting to promote the urgent convocation of such a conference.

Accepting the message, Yasir 'Arafat expressed his profound gratitude to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for the solidarity the Soviet Union had displayed with the population of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and put a high value on the principled policy of the Soviet Union, which firmly advocates attainment of a comprehensive Near East settlement at the earliest opportunity and firmly supports the just cause of the Palestinian people.

Ambassador to Kuwait on Soviet Gulf Policy

LD190927 Kuwait KUNA in English 0803 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Kuwait, Jan 19 (KUNA)—The Soviet ambassador to Kuwait, Ernest Zverev, was quoted here Tuesday as saying that his country will continue its attempts to establish a multi-national force that shoulders the responsibility of security in the Arabian Gulf waters.

Meanwhile, the Soviet ambassador, in an interview with the Kuwaiti daily "AL-QABAS," maintained that a decision by the international community to halt arms shipments to the party that rejects peace calls for ending the Iraq-Iran war "will be very difficult" to implement.

"Taking a decision (such as this) will not be enough. The importance lies in the availability of effective and practical means to implement this decision," said Zverev, in reply to a question on a follow-up resolution that would impose sanctions on either Iran or Iraq.

"We are accused by some Arab and Gulf governments of being reluctant to support such a resolution," he complained, adding that the Soviet Union's position is misunderstood because "Moscow has been observing the sought arms embargo for seven years and a half."

The Soviet diplomat noted that his country is not sure whether the international community can force American, Israeli and Western nations to abide by such sanctions once adopted by the U.N.

Before adopting such a resolution, he suggested, there should be legal changes inside these countries that would conform with an arms embargo against the party that insists on continuing the war.

On the issue of an international naval force in the Gulf, Zverev told the newspaper that all foreign presence in the Gulf should be withdrawn and replaced by a multinational force that would be entrusted with keeping safety of navigation in the Gulf waters.

Such an idea has been proposed by Moscow months ago, but several nations, including the United States rejected the proposal, claiming an international presence would provoke Iran which will perceive it as a move directed against it.

The Soviet Union has not given up its attempts on this idea, Zverev said.

Najibullah Addresses Reconciliation Commission

LD162230 Moscow TASS in English 2148 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Kabul January 16 TASS—An anniversary meeting of the supreme special commission on national reconciliation in Afghanistan which had been established a year ago, was held in the Afghan capital today. It was set up after the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan took the course for ending the sanguinary war and establishing coalition forms of state administration.

The report at the commission's meeting was delivered by President Najibullah.

He said that in the past year 3,200 villages sided with people's power peacefully. A total of 110,000 countrymen returned to native places from Pakistani and Iranian camps. Over 40,000 armed mutineers stopped resistance and signed protocols on armistice and cease-fire, and 6,000 [of] their representatives joined coalition organs of government. As many as 19,000 people were released from prisons at the intercession of national reconciliation commissions. All in all, some three million people live now in "peace zones".

Intense development of the national economy, stepped-up activities of private entrepreneurs, manufacturers, improvement of the agrarian-water legislation, encouragement of handicrafts and the cottage industry, development of the market system are a graphic sign of reconciliation. In the past year 30 new and old industrial enterprises started or resumed their operations in Afghanistan. Incidentally, most of them belong to the private and mixed sectors. The volume of industrial production rose 3.7 per cent, 138,000 tonnes of wheat were procured. Such results were never accomplished either before or after the revolution. In the past year over 700,000 people received pay rises.

Speaking of the preparation for elections to the National Council and Organs of local government, the Afghan leader said: "Failing to receive agreement from chieftains of counter-revolution to form a coalition government, we started forming coalition in localities. In the near future a law on elections will be taken, and we shall launch an election campaign at once. We are waiting that the opposition will be able to appraise sensibly an offered chance to participate practically in forming a new structure of government and will take part in the elections."

Najibullah explained that if the Geneva talks are a success, Soviet troops would be withdrawn in 1988. Even today there are no Soviet troops in 13 provinces.

"Our main aim is," said Najibullah, "to make the second year of national reconciliation decisive and to lend this process an irreversible character."

Najibullah called again on the opposition to appraise objectively the government's programme for the second year of national reconciliation.

Interview on Reconciliation

LD151633 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Interview with unidentified Radio Moscow correspondent in Kabul; date not given]

[Text] January 15th marks exactly 1 year since the Afghan leadership started a policy of national reconciliation. In an interview with our correspondent in Kabul President Najibullah discussed what fruit it has borne.

What is most important is that during this time national reconciliation has become a reality, President Najibullah said. Thousands of villages protected from destruction, thousands of compatriots saved, new works, restored homes, mosques and schools—such are the early fruits of national reconciliation. With every passing day ever more Afghans have been talking a language of peace with each other. The unilateral cease-fire, 4 major compromises and concessions have demonstrated to the whole world the readiness of the people's government to start a peace dialogue with the opposition and to find a peaceful solution to the internal conlfict. The new constitution was adopted. It embodied the age-old anti-despotic traditions and the Afghans' longing for true democracy, freedom and equality. Political efforts made by people, unwilling to continue the war, provide in a practical way for many forms of coalition rule. Representatives of the opposition have been elected to local municipal councils and national reconciliation commissions. Former anti-government group leaders have been nominated to posts of provincial government. Ministers of the former regime have been invited to take up senior government posts.

But today we can see that to pursue the new policy is much more difficult than it seemed before. Over the past year, President Najibullah noted, we could have achieved much more in all fields of reconciliation. But not everything depends on us, he added. The enemy has stepped up military and political interference. Washington and its regional underlings are expanding aggression against the Afghan people. The counterrevolutionary extremists are seeking to thwart national reconciliation by every means. Those who are not interested in a political settlement in and around Afghanistan bog it down in debates on terms for the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops.

In fact, President Najibullah said, the problem of Afghanistan is not the problem of the presence of Soviet troops. All of us, he noted, are very grateful to our Soviet friends for the effective assistance they gave us by sending their soldiers-internationalists to Afghanistan. Moved by the sincere desire to speed up their return home, we have decided in coordination with the Soviet side to complete their withdrawal in 12 months and maybe less, of course bearing in mind the end of meddling in Afghanistan's internal affairs and the guarantee that interference will not be resumed, President Najibullah said, and he added that his country was looking forward to the forthcoming round at the Geneva talks with Pakistan arranged through the mediation of the envoy of the United Nations secretary general. We will go to Geneva in good faith and do everything to make it the conclusive round.

More on Najibullah WASHINGTON POST Interview

LD171524 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] Washington January 17 TASS—The continuing outside interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is the only obstacle on the way to the return home of Soviet troops staying in that country at the request of its government.

This has been stated in an interview with THE WASHINGTON POST by President Najibullah of Afghanistan. He pointed out that if the interference from abroad was stopped, if the guarantees were given of its non-resumption and if the opposition responded positively to a ceasefire proposal, this could reduce the time of the return home of Soviet troops.

Tamils' Cease-Fire Call Noted in Indian Circles

PM191355 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent N. Paklin dispatch under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "The 'Tigers' Are Proposing Terms"]

[Text] Delhi—The Indian newspaper THE STATESMAN has published a letter from V. Prabakharan, leader of the Tamil organization "Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam," to Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi.

He sent this message from his underground headquarters in the city of Jaffna. "In light of the continuing violence and cruel suffering of our people, I once again appeal to you to cease offensive operations and begin peace talks in order to stop the war, establish peace, and enable us to return to a normal life," he said in the letter.

The leader of the "Tigers" said that his organization will lay down its arms as soon as a provisional administrative council for the northern and eastern provinces is established—as envisaged by the terms of the 29 July 1987 Indian-Sri Lankan agreement to end the ethnic conflict—in which the majority of the seats will be won by his supporters. He pointed out in the letter that the return of the Indian peacekeeping forces to the positions they held prior to the beginning of the offensive against the "Tigers" in October last year "will facilitate a return to peace and normal life in the regions where the Tamils live." The leader of the "Tigers" gave as a prior condition the guarantee of a "broad amnesty" by the Sri Lankan authorities and the release of members of his organization and their supporters.

Reports on the "Tigers'" intention to lay down their arms are also coming in from the eastern province, where the focus of the combat operations has recently shifted.

Political circles in the Indian capital do not rule out the possibility that the letter from V. Prabakharan is a new maneuver designed to give a respite to "Tiger" detachments battered in the fray, stock up on arms, and present the organization in a good light, considering the noticeable fall in its prestige among the Sri Lankan Tamil population.

The Indian Government has repeatedly stated that it is in favor of fully implementing the terms of the Indian-Sri Lankan agreement, including the surrender of arms by the "Tigers," the formation of a provisional administrative council for the two provinces, and a broad amnesty. Having originally agreed to these terms, the "Tigers" then took an extremist stance. They have declared themselves to be the "sole representatives" of the Sri Lankan Tamils and begun to deal mercilessly with rival Tamil groups while simultaneously attacking innocent Sinhalese living in the eastern province.

Delhi is expecting a visit in the next few days from J. Jayewardene, president of the island state, to discuss measures with R. Gandhi to end the new bloody conflict and implement the earlier agreement.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Telegrams Describe Nature of Ghanaian Relations

PM191045 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] To mark the 30th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Ghana the USSR Foreign Ministry and O. Asamoah, Ghanaian Provisional National Defense Council secretary for foreign affairs, exchanged congratulatory telegrams.

The Soviet telegram says stable relations of mutual understanding, trust, and cooperation have taken shape between the two countries, a constructive political dialogue is being maintained, and useful ties have been organized in the trade and economic, cultural, scientific, and other spheres. It expresses confidence that the further expansion of the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Ghana will meet the interests of the countries' peoples.

In his turn O. Asamoah, Ghanaian Provisional National Defense Council secretary for foreign affairs, remarking on the friendly and mutually advantageous character of Soviet-Ghanaian relations, stressed that our countries share similar views on many topical international questions, and in particular on the problems of strengthening peace, liberating Africa, and establishing a just and equitable new world order. The telegram gives a high evaluation of the USSR's foreign policy course, which is designed to consolidate international peace and security, and expresses the hope for the further strengthening of the ties of friendship and cooperation between Ghana and the Soviet Union.

African Information Ministers Meet in Ethiopia

LD140234 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 13 Jan 88

[Text] Addis Ababa January 13 (TASS)—African information ministers opened a conference in the Ethiopian capital today.

The Ethiopian leader, Mengistu Haile Mariam, addressing the conference, called for establishing a new information order in the continent.

Without this, he pointed out, it would be impossible to put an end to cultural imperialism whose effect was felt by African countries and to attain final political and economic liberation.

The Ethiopian leader pointed out that foreign mass media serving monopolistic circles were hindering the efforts to strengthen inter-African understanding.

Western news agencies manipulated facts and tendentiously covered developments in Africa. They rarely reported successes accomplished by African nations in handling problems many of which were rooted deep in their colonial past. But they used every occasion to exaggerate differences that emerged between African countries.

The Pan-African News Agency (PANA) was called upon to play an important role in establishing a new information order, Mengistu Haile Mariam said. It was an instrument that would help Africa get rid of foreign control over information and establish a reliable exchange of trustworthy news.

PANA, set up in 1983, comprises 43 national news agencies. Its head office is in Dakar, Senegal. Its daily news production is more than 20,000 words.

East Europe

Bulgaria To Attend Seoul Olympics

PM071349 Moscow SOVETSKIY SPORT in Russian 6 Jan 88 p 1

[TASS report: "Bulgarian National Olympic Committee Decision"]

[Text] Sofia—The Bulgarian National Olympic Committee has given a positive response to the IOC invitation to take part in the 1988 Summer Olympics.

As reported by BTA, the decision was taken at a National Olympic Committee plenum held in the Bulgarian capital.

The plenum stressed that Bulgaria's sports leadership supports all initiatives of the IOC and its president, J. A. Samaranch, designed to achieve a decision on the joint holding of the 1988 Games acceptable to South Korea and the DPRK. This would be in the interests of the whole Olympic movement and would help strengthen peace and friendship among sportsmen of all countries.

Loginov, Poland's Olechowski Hold Consultations

PM181515 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Soviet-Polish Consultations"]

[Text] Soviet-Polish consultations involving USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.P. Loginov, and Polish Deputy Foreign Minister T. Olechowski, took place 14-15 January at the USSR Foreign Ministry. The exchange of opinions on questions of Soviet-Polish cooperation in international affairs took place in the comradely atmosphere characteristic of relations between the USSR and Poland.

CPCZ Presidium Approves Jakes Visit Results

LD151942 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Prague January 15 TASS—The Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia approved at its meeting today the results of the visit of Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee, to the Soviet Union and his talks with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Presidium obliged corresponding agencies to see to it that the understanding reached during the visit and aimed at further developing cooperation between the two fraternal parties and countries, be put into life.

Correction to Central Committee GDR Visit

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Vorontsov Heads Delegation on GDR Visit," published in the 13 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 26:

The headline should read "Voronov Heads Delegation on GDR Visit."

Paragraph one, sentence one: ...A delegation of CPSU party workers headed by Yu. P. Voronov, CPSU Central Committee Culture Department chief...(changing "Vorontsov" to "Voronov.")

West Europe

Shevardnadze Pays Visit to West Germany

Moscow Send-Off

LD171351 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] Today Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Foreign minister, left Moscow on official visits to the FRG and Spain. At the airport he was seen off by Slyunkov, member of the politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Vorontsev, first deputy minister of foreign affairs; and other officials. Among those seeing him off were the FRG charge d'affaires in the USSR Arno and the Spanish charge d'affaires in the USSR De Noriega.

Officials' Previsit Remarks

LD171157 Moscow TASS in English 0910 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn January 17 TASS—The Federal Government attaches special priority to the relations with the Soviet Union. This was stated in Bonn today by Friedhelm Ost, an official representative of the government. The coming visit of the USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will continue a series of high-level contacts between representatives of the two countries and testify to the both peoples' striving to deepen cooperation between European countries, to work for concrete results in that area. In the course of conversations with Eduard Shevardnadze, Chancellor Helmut Kohl intends to discuss a broad range of bilateral and international relations, including humanitarian problems, said Friedhelm Ost.

FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher also underlined great significance of the visit for the development and deepening of relations between the two states. In an interview to the newspaper BILD AM SONNTAG he said that the governments of the USSR and the FRG firmly intend to turn a new page in the Soviet-West German relations and fill it with a qualitatively new content. A protocol is to be signed in the course of the visit on regular consultations between the foreign ministers and the relevant agencies. A long-term treaty on economic cooperation is to be prolonged for another five years.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher said that both governments viewed the agreement as a foundation for the further growth of economic exchange and cooperation, the possibilities fof which are far from having been exhausted.

The FRG foreign minister declared for the continuation of the disarmament process. After the summit meeting in Washington which is of great significance, he said, we expect from the USSR and the USA accords on a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive potentials. We hope for the successful course of the Geneva conference. A treaty on worldwide destruction of chemical weapons could be signed at the conference already this year, he said.

Statement on Arrival

LD171712 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 17 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn January 17 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, arrived here today for an official visit at the invitation of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG).

At the airport decked out with the state flags of the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic, the guest was met by Hans-Dietrich Genscher, vice-chancellor, minister of foreign affairs, of the FRG, and by other officials.

Among the welcoming party was Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, the ambassador of the USSR to the FRG.

Upon arrival, Eduard Shevardnadze made a following statement:

"We have arrived in the capital of the Federal Republic of Germany in high spirits, with kind feelings, and great hopes. Our visit is being made agianst the background of the emergence and development of new favourable tendencies in international affairs and we would like to believe that this meeting on the Rhine will serve to assert them.

"I believe that the conditions and circumstances in which it will take place are contributary factors in this respect.

"The treaty signed in Washington several weeks ago on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is sealed not only by the signatures of the top leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States but also by the good will of many European countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany.

"Frequent contacts of the recent period between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and statesmen of the Federal Republic likewise constitute positive signs of the new time in which we see a mutual desire to tone up our relations and the extent of their wholesome influence on the state of affairs in Europe and throughout the world.

"The visit by Federal President Richard von Weizsaecker to Moscow and the personal correspondence between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl have given a new dimension to our relations. I would like to add that this is being also promoted by the activities of my counterpart, Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

"Our dialogue, naturally, centres on the problems of security, both European and universal. This dialogue in all its aspects is being facilitated by the elements of new political realism and thinking which increasingly manifest themselves in the foreign policy practice of our partners from the Federal Republic.

Availing myself of the opportunity, I wish happiness, wellbeing and peace to all people of the Federal Republic, just as the residents of hospitable Bonn".

On the same day Eduard Shevardnadze had a meeting with [FRG Foreign Minister] Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

Talks Held, Speeches Given

PM191321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Positive Dialogue"]

[Excerpts] Bonn, 18 Jan—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, who is here on an official visit, has met with FRG President R. von Weizsaecker. Greetings and good wishes were conveyed to the president from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

There was a thorough discussion of a wide range of problems of interest to both states. Questions of security were at the center of attention. The emphasis was placed on preserving the dynamics of the current disarmament talks and taking further steps to reduce nuclear arms, impose a total ban on chemical weapons, and lower the level of military confrontation in the sphere of conventional arms and armed forces.

A fundamental coincidence in the two sides' approaches to these problems and a high degree of agreement with regard to the fact that in the modern world it is important for all countries to be guided by the principle of reasonable sufficiency and by the concept of nonoffensive defense in building their armed forces were revealed. This must also be reflected in the formulation of states' military doctrines.

R. von Weizsaecker hailed the large-scale transformations taking place in the USSR, the policy of restructuring and glasnost, and the improvement of cooperation in resolving humanitarian questions.

The conversation was of a friendly nature.

E.A. Shevardnadze continued his talks today with H.-D. Genscher, FRG deputy federal chancellor and foreign minister. The ministers examined the situation taking shape in specific areas of the process of disarmament, the strengthening of trust, and the consolidation of peace and international security in the context of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the change for the better which has become apparent in international affairs. The need was emphasized for the consistent implementation of real disarmament measures both in Europe and on a global scale.

The question of the state of and prospects for Soviet-West German relations and of the potential for the two countries' cooperation in various spheres was discussed on a principled and broad plane.

Some aspects of the development of the all-European process were examined, above all in the context of the Vienna meeting of representatives of CSCE participant states.

Work was being done simultaneously in specially created working groups on bilateral relations, on questions of security and disarmament, and also on legal and humanitarian problems.

E.A. Shevardnadze had a meeting in an unconstrained atmosphere with representatives of business circles, with the participation of O. Wolf von Amerongen, president of the FRG Association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry; representatives of major banks and concerns, including Dresdner Bank, Deutsche Bank, Ruhrgas, Mannesmann, Volkswagen, and BASF; and leaders of many firms cooperating with Soviet organizations and enterprises. The development prospects for Soviet-West German economic ties were discussed with regard to the radical economic reform taking place in the USSR and the opportunities being opened up in this connection. It was stated at the meeting that the removal of the currently existing obstacles and restrictions in bilateral trade, including the Cocom lists, would meet mutual interests. This would give a new boost to the improvement of mutually advantageous business ties between the Soviet Union and the FRG.

A frank and constructive exchange of opinions on international problems and some questions of bilateral relations was continued during a meeting with F.-J. Strauss, prime minister of the Land of Bavaria and chairman of the Christian Social Union. The West German politician evaluated highly the results of his Moscow meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his talks with other Soviet leaders.

E.A. Shevardnadze pointed out that the Soviet Union is ready to develop mutually advantageous cooperation with the FRG and its largest Land, Bavaria, in various spheres on the basis of the 1970 Moscow treaty. The possibilities for its development on an increasing scale exist, but both sides must, of course, make an effort for this.

The USSR foreign minister had talks with M. Bangemann, chairman of the Free Democratic Party and FRG economics minister, during which questions of cooperation, above all in the economic area, were discussed. The Soviet side noted the Free Democratic Party's positive role in shaping relations between the two countries and its contribution to concluding the Moscow treaty and implementing the constructive "Ostpolitik."

In the evening of the same day H.-D. Genscher gave a dinner in E.A. Shevardnadze's honor, at which there was an exchange of speeches.

Welcoming the Soviet guest, the FRG foreign minister pointed out that the Washington meeting between U.S. President R. Reagan and M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was an event of historic significance. It showed that it is really possible to curb the arms race. It is the common task of East and West to consistently continue this process and make it irreversible. It is possible rightfully to speak of a turning point in East-West relations. This is opening up prospects for a better future. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles must open the way to other arms control accords. The sooner it is ratified, the better.

We welcome the intention of the United States and the Soviet Union to conclude an agreement on a 50% reduction in strategic nuclear potentials as early as the first half of this year. The speediest signing of an agreement on the universal elimination of chemical weapons is a particularly important task. These monstrous weapons must disappear entirely from the face of the earth once and for all. We have drawn closer together at the talks on this problem to such an extent that, given joint efforts by all participants, the conclusion of this agreement appears possible.

Nuclear missiles with a range of up to 500 km are of special significance for us Germans. The Soviet and U.S. ground-based, short-range [ponizhennoy dalnosti] nuclear missiles are included in the NATO concept with regard to arms control. The FRG Government will continue to promote the drawing up of a mandate for talks on these kinds of arms. Arms control and disarmament have been and still are for us an inalienable constituent part of our security policy. We are ready for balanced and verifiable joint decisions in all spheres of the military correlation of forces. It must be the joint aim of East and West to create effective structures for a joint security policy which will rule out the waging of any war.

We want, H.-D. Genscher continued, to open a new page in Soviet-West German relations and to fill it with specific contents. E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to the FRG will promote this.

Soviet-West German relations are of central significance for us and for all of Europe. The Moscow treaty, whose potential has still been far from exhausted, is the reliable foundation of these relations. Tomorrow we will sign the protocol on consultations. This is a significant, qualitative step that must lend permanence and intensity to the bilateral dialogue. It attests to awareness of the fact that there is no alternative to cooperation and interaction among states, as well as the responsibility that lies with the FRG and the Soviet Union. The establishment of new general consulates in Kiev and Munich will contribute to mutual understanding, exchanges, and cooperation.

In the coming years, too, economic ties will be one of the mainstays of our cooperation. They still do not correspond to the potential both sides possess. The reduction in commodity turnover in the past 2 years shows that we must give a new boost to our trade relations. The FRG Government and our economic circles are elaborating new forms of cooperation. There will be a thorough discussion of this at the session of the Soviet-FRG Commission for Economic, Scientific, and Technical

Cooperation. Vocational and technical education and the improvement of cadres, particularly leading cadres, is a promising new sphere of cooperation.

We also pin great hopes on the development of scientific and technical cooperation. Both states possess considerable scientific research potential, which must be utilized not only to mutual advantage but also in the interests of all mankind. This also concerns environmental protection. The danger threatening nature does not stop at borders. During President R. von Weizsaecker's visit to the Soviet Union, both sides stated their intention to expand exchanges in the cultural sphere. Mutual familiarization with the other people's achievements in this area leads to destruction of biased views and to mutual understanding, which are essential for the European peoples' peaceful coexistence.

In the humanitarian sphere, we continue to show interest in Soviet citizens of German nationality. We have noted with great satisfaction that there has been an appreciable increase over the past year in the number of persons who have visited our country and resettled in it.

We regard the strengthening and development of our bilateral relations as part of the larger task of creating a lasting peaceful order in Europe, in which states can live without fear of one another and under conditions of peaceful cooperation. We must not look at the partition of Europe as an immutable fact but must overcome it. The European peoples' rapprochement would be of the greatest advantage to Europeans themselves. How often we have wasted our efforts in confrontation, how often the peoples of Europe have had to experience terrible wars. How much misfortune World War II brought them. We know and will never forget what suffering was inflicted on the peoples of the Soviet Union and what sacrifices they had to make.

In subsequent decades we have been able to preserve peace. However, what an effort it costs both sides to ensure security. We must now take a new path: Ensure greater security with fewer and fewer weapons.

The Soviet side speaks of the creation of a "common European home." This is a figurative concept that we ,too, are prepared to adopt. It must be a home in which doors do not bar but open up the way to each other. We need an intensive dialogue on what the future of our continent must be like. We understand the Helsinki Final Act as an instrument for creating the future Europe, which must help to satisfy the universal need for greater security, greater cooperation, and respect for human rights. Therefore, we hope for the speediest successful conclusion of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the CSCE participant states with progress in all three baskets.

We are following with great attention, H.-D. Genscher went on to say, the internal processes taking place in your country. Your efforts aimed at implementing reforms meet with our understanding and sympathy. We expect the Soviet Union to be more open as a result of these social and economic reforms. Therefore, we consider it important for the principle of glasnost to be applied also in the Soviet Union's relations with the West.

As of 1 January 1988, the FRG is chairing the EEC. It will make efforts to develop a joint European foreign policy of the 12 states making up this community. It is precisely in East-west relations that these states want to play an independent role. We want to use every opportunity for dialogue and cooperation in our relations with the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states. We want the speediest establishment of official relations between the EEC and CEMA. The Western countries' partnership is being given a new boost not by a sense of being threatened, as used to be the case, but by the growing potential for making their contribution to the radical improvement of East-West relations.

The desire to settle vexed questions and for cooperation must not be confined to Europe. It must also be manifested in the settlement of regional problems and conflicts. This applies particularly to Afghanistan. We welcome the USSR foreign minister's statement on the possibility of a Soviet troop withdrawal from that country during 1988. That would be a decisive step of great significance for international relations.

E.A. Shevardnadze said in a reply speech:

Right from the start, I would like to pay tribute to tradition and at the same time to testify to our devotion to innovation.

Tradition commands me to say thank you for the kind words and wishes addressed to us here. I do so sincerely and from the heart.

In what you have said, Mr Minister, I also sensed the desire to give new interpretations to traditional aspects of our relations. We welcome such an approach. It is in line with the idea expressed by M.S. Gorbachev at talks with the president of your country, that "opportunity exists for a rethinking of relations between our two countries; we are ready for this."

While advocating broad foundations in relations between the FRG and the USSR, which would be of truly historic significance, we are not calling for revision of our roles and places in the systems and alliances we have adopted. Everything can and should stay as it is, with the exception of the components of efforts being undertaken to strengthen stability of relations between our countries, which, as M.S. Gorbachev has said, makes for stability in Europe, and is in line with their own interests and those of the European and world community of states. If there is anything to review, then it is only the sum of opportunities of which we could make better use in this direction.

I expect, Mr Minister, that this will make up the substance and goal of our current talks with you. I greatly value the opportunity I have been given to set forth our views on this matter to the federal president and the federal chancellor, and to hear their opinions.

Now, returning to tradition, I would like to wish all those present a Happy New Year for 1988 and wish you all great happiness. For us this is connected with the movement toward a nuclear-free world, the first step toward which was taken with the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

In this sense our good wishes are not entirely traditional, for we are talking about our entry not so much into a new year, as into a qualitatively new and previously unknown state. The conclusion of the first ever treaty on nuclear disarmament, to which the FRG, among other states, contributed so actively and so opportunely, means that we have adopted a new political chronology. The new way of counting time will have a meaning, if it is based not only on new intentions but is reflected in new deeds.

The only beginning that has good prospects is one where the past does not overshadow the future, and concerns about the future do not carry on the standards of the past. The only cooperation with good prospects is one founded on mutual recognition and respect for existing realities and aspirations to take maximum account of each other's interests. This is taught us by the experience of the conclusion of the Moscow treaty. We must draw fully on the huge possibilities contained in this document, and go forward, creating a new quality in our mutual relations.

I will explain this theory by other examples of the practical policy of the Soviet Union. Thus, in striving to scrap nuclear weapons, we consider it extremely important to observe here the principle of justice, and not only in relation to ourselves. We see it in seeking to achieve at the first stages removing from the arsenals of those nuclear weapons with a geographically selected application. Take tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. Be they Soviet or American, these arms will be used primarily, and, it can be said, exclusively, against European states situated on the line of contiguity of two military-political alliances. We favor the total scrapping of tactical nuclear weapons, which would correspond to the vital interests of all Europeans.

Naturally, such a solution to this question is possible only with the participation of the other nuclear states, and it is not our fault that they are not yet ready for that. For that reason it would be possible to start if only from looking at the question of dual-purpose launchers at the future negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe. The nuclear component itself could be made the subject of corresponding negotiations in the future, without, however, putting off this matter for a lengthy period.

The question of a chemical weapons ban is an acute one. One does not require great intellect to see which countries can become the target of a chemical attack. Here one cannot but wonder why obstacles toward concluding a convention ban on chemical weapons are being put up by a country that knows, has been given an assurance, and been guaranteed that these weapons will not be used on its territory.

All that has been said here has but one objective, and that is to show that in current conditions, the realities of foreign policy can and must be analyzed by means of common sense, and that one should approach them guided by the standards of ordinary common decency. This, incidentally, is borne out by the recent Washington prologue to the process of thorough, consistent disarmament. Having revealed the possibility of a practical dialogue between East and West, directed toward a high political result, it showed that when political statesmen want something, they can achieve it.

And what further? A cardinal reduction of strategic nuclear potentials; creation of reliable guarantees for preserving a peaceful cosmos; a full and universal ban on chemical weapons; their global destruction; a radical lowering of the levels of confrontation in conventional weapons and armed forces; the attainment of accord on the total halt to nuclear tests.

We can adhere to different systems of values, but in all of these problems we have one system of coordinates: security and survival.

I will single out conventional weapons. Who said that the Soviet Union does not want to consider this problem seriously? Such assertions remind me of the history of the question of the monitoring [kontrol] of weapons. Whole years went by in logomachy over this. They scared the world and each other with the unwillingness of the Soviet Union to take measures of broad and truly universal verification [kontrolya], like a chimera of the Middle Ages. Today mutual inspections are becoming a daily reality.

We are ready for talks on the problem of conventional weapons. We are interested in whether we can count on a reciprocal constructive readiness from our West European partners.

A very great deal also depends on the position of the FRG.

The solid stock created by us to date of mutual understanding inspires the hope that our countries will increasingly be able to act in the role of partners.

Such a partnership would proclaim itself most beneficially also in the further development of bilateral relations between the USSR and the FRG. Objective prerequisites for this exist.

We note with satisfaction that the need to remove unjustified discriminating barriers from the path of trade-economic and scientific-technical cooperation is being recognized more today than previously.

Our countries can give each other more than they have so far. Regardless of the existing fundamental differences in opinions, mutually acceptable solutions can always be found with goodwill and flexibility. That which cannot be the subject of practical policy today must be left for history to solve. As is known, history has not sworn loyalty to anybody's constitution. On the contrary, constitutions and laws have been changing and will continue to change under the influence of historical development and the logic of realities. No one has had or has any other choice than to believe in progress and commonsense.

Pondering about the relations between traditions and innovations, I remember the remarkable advice of Georg Christoph Lichtenberg to his contemporaries: Try to keep up with the times. This advice is also for us who live in the present terrible age for all that exists. Following him we are displaying our loyalty to the European humane tradition and will show political innovation.

I very much like the title of one FRG publication published for readers in the Soviet Union—GUTEN TAG, or GOOD DAY. I would like to wish our relations on the whole to gravitate toward such a heading. I can say that people of our entire vast country are in favor of this.

Present at the dinner were prominent FRG statesmen and politicians, representatives of the West German public, and also workers from Soviet establishments in the FRG.

Genscher Talks 'Constructive'

LD181215 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1113 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn, 18 Jan (TASS)—The exchange of opinions that started yesterday between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Foreign Minister, who is here for an official visit at the invitation of the FRG Government and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, vice federal chancellor and FRG foreign minister, continued in Bonn today. The talks are being held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

At the morning session there was a detailed examination of the broad range of relations between the USSR and the FRG. Within the context of positive changes in the world and in Europe as a result of the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles the importance of the regular contacts established between the two countries' foreign ministers was noted. Hope was expressed for further deepening of the political dialogue.

The sides stressed that the decades which have elapsed since the war, the positive experience of cooperation that has been accumulated, the objective requirements of the two countries in developing the economy, science and technology, and culture, the exchange of ideas and information, and the indivisibility of the security of modern Europe, make it necessary to reinterpret the state of Soviet-West German relations and the great opportunities which their active development offers.

The atmosphere in Europe and, indeed, the entire progress of the pan-European process and construction of our European home, to a great extent depends on the state of Soviet-West German relations, E. Shevardnadze stressed.

H-D. Genscher pointed out, in his turn, that the FRG Government attributes prime importance to relations with the Soviet Union. He expressed himself in favor of further development of all-round ties between the two countries at various levels.

During a discussion of matters relating to economic, scientific and technical cooperation and of bilateral trade the sides advocated that new forms of economic interaction, including production cooperation and establishment of joint enterprises should be sought and introduced. It is in this sphere that most opportunities exist. In doing so, use can be made of the considerable experience of cooperation which already exists. The restructuring of the economic mechanism in the USSR creates favorable prerequisites for this.

The Soviet side drew attention to the need to remove obstacles to the development of economic contacts. Among such obstacles are, in particular, the Cocom [Coordinating Commission on Export Controls] lists. Otherwise, it will be difficult for the USSR to participate in an equal international division of labor and no large-scale cooperation will be established. Here it is necessary to renounce previous attitudes and translate into practical deeds the declarations of the FRG leaders to the effect that a policy of economic and technological schism is not in the interests of any European state. The West German side expressed the intention of helping to remove the impediments that are hindering the normal development of bilateral economic ties.

E. Shevardnadze invited H-D. Genscher to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Working groups on bilateral relations, security and disarmament, and legal and humanitarian problems were set up and began their discussions.

Genscher Talks End

LD191238 Moscow TASS in English 1224 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn January 19 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, and Hans-Dietrich

Genscher, deputy federal chancellor and foreign minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, ended their talks here today.

During their final meeting both sides expressed satisfaction with the work that has been done and has revealed the interest of the two countries in continuing dialogue on a wide range of pressing international and bilateral issues.

It was pointed out that the visit and the accords reached during it have marked another important step forward in furthering political dialogue between the two countries and making it substantive.

The Soviet side stressed that it will do everything for the USSR and the FRG to be able to live in peace and security and build their relations like good neighbors to their mutual benefit.

"Today we are witnessing how the new pace in Soviet-West German relations, which Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke about during Genscher's visit to the USSR in 1987, is being filled in," Shevardnadze said.

The two foreign ministers heard reports on the results of meetings by the working groups on bilateral relations, on security and disarmament, and on legal and humanitarian matters.

The work done by the groups was rated useful. Note was taken, in particular, of the importance of proposals helping to lend bilateral contacts a greater variety of forms, as well as of the concurrence of the two sides' positions on the issue of banning chemical weapons.

Agreement was reached to conduct consultations on legal and humanitarian matters. The next such consultations are to be held in late 1988 in Moscow.

Both sides drew content from the new forms of expert-level discussions on problems of interest to the USSR and the FRG. It was agreed to carry on consultations between Soviet and West German Foreign Ministry officials on the whole gamut of these problems.

Bilateral documents prepared in time for the visit were signed, including a protocol on consultations and a protocol on talks on issues connected with the opening of consulates general of the USSR in Munich and of the FRG in Kiev.

Notes were exchanged on renewing the May 6, 1978 agreement on developing and deepening long-term cooperation between the USSR and the FRG in economic and industrial fields for another five years, starting from December 26, 1988.

The two foreign ministers voiced the hope that the signed documents, which have substantially broadened the legal base of bilateral relations, will help to make them more dynamic and contribute to promoting good-neighborliness, mutually advantageous cooperation and trust between the people of the two countries.

Holds Talks With Strauss

LD181844 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn January 18 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, met with Franz-Josef Strauss, Bavarian prime minister and chairman of the Christian-Social Union.

They continued the frank and constructive exchange of opinions on international problems and bilateral issues started during the West German politician's recent visit to the USSR.

Strauss spoke highly of his talks in Moscow with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other Soviet leaders.

Shevardnadze said the meetings with Strauss in Moscow had been useful and essential for consolidating trust and mutual understanding between the two countries.

The Soviet Union, he added, was, for its part, prepared to develop mutually beneficial cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany and with its major land, Bavaria, in various fields on the basis of the Moscow treaty of 1970.

Possibilities for such cooperation to increase, were, of course, available, but efforts were required on both sides to tap them, the Soviet foreign minister said.

Meets With Economics Minister

LD182011 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn January 18 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, had a meeting here today with Martin Bangemann, chairman of the Free Democratic Party and economics minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, to discuss bilateral relations, most notably economic contacts.

The Soviet foreign minister pointed to the positive role of the Free Democratic Party in shaping the relationship between the two countries and its contribution to the signature of the Moscow treaty and to the implementation of constructive "ostpolitik".

He said that in the Soviet Union they appreciated that.

Shevardnadze added that changes and a turn for the better in Soviet-West German relations were ripe, that both countries would only benefit from good cooperation in political, economic and other fields and that history borne [as received] that out graphically.

The Soviet foreign minister stressed the importance of increasing the effectiveness of bilateral business ties, updating their forms and lending them greater diversity and dynamism.

That was only possible, however, with respect for the principles of equality and mutual benefit and the awareness that any discrimination and restructions in trade were inadmissible, Shevardnadze said.

Bangemann reiterated his party's readiness to pursue cooperation with the Soviet Union in different fields and develop new and progressive forms of bilateral economic relations.

He pointed to an interest in this country to the perestroyka effort in the Soviet Union, including changes in the economy, and expected it to furnish extra opportunities for West German businesses to trade with the USSR.

The meeting was held in a constructive atmosphere of good will.

Meets With Businessmen

LD181530 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1425 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Bonn, 18 Jan (TASS)—A meeting took place in Bonn today between Eduard Shevardnadze and representatives of FRG business circles. In the conversation the participants had a detailed exchange of opinions on issues relating to Soviet-West German relations.

The USSR foreign minister stressed that in the sphere of foreign policy, as confirmed by the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union will continue to conduct strictly a policy toward peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems and toward achieving new, far-reaching agreements in the disarmament sphere. Since security in the modern world can only be universal, the actions of each state in the international arena should necessarily take this as their point of departure and should proceed from the impermissibility of wars and armed conflicts and from the understanding of the need to assist by all possible means the transition from confrontation to broad international cooperation. He stressed that achievements on a broad scale in the international economic sphere should follow the current major political improvements in the international arena.

It was noted in this context that the business circles, aware of their responsibility for the state of affairs in the world, can make an important contribution to strengthening trust between peoples and normalizing the international situation. The sphere of economic cooperation is a factor that has a permanent and stabilizing effect on the development of relations between states, including those between the USSR and the FRG, too.

E.A. Shevardnadze described restructuring in the Soviet Union as a revolutionary stage accompanied by a broad development of democracy and glasnost and spoke of the prospects opened by this deep political and spiritual process to Soviet society, Soviet enterprises, and their workers. It is the question of revealing the entire potential of the socialist system and increasing sharply their efficiency of the Soviet economy and all aspects of Soviet society in general.

Speaking about prospects for trade and economic relations between the USSR and the FRG, the USSR foreign minister noted that the objective prerequisites necessary for their development are evident. These include the large-scale economic and intellectual potentials of the two countries, their geographic proximity, the presence of a substantial treaty-law basis, the long-standing traditions of economic links, and the deep changes taking place in the Soviet economy, including the area of managing foreign economic activity. Transition to new forms of business cooperation—the establishment of joint enterprises and the development of production cooperation—could play an important role in this process.

At the same time, the removal of the obstacles and restrictions that currently exist in bilateral trade, including the notorious Cocom lists, would correspond to the interests of both sides. This would provide new stimuli toward improving mutually beneficial business ties between the Soviet Union and the FRG. E.A. Shevardnadze called for development by means of bilateral cooperation in high-technology industries: in space, electronics, and computer technology.

The representatives of West German business circles displayed interest in the progress of restructuring in the USSR and in the opportunities opening up for economic cooperation between the two countries in this connection. For their part, they expressed readiness to develop economic ties with the Soviet Union, using both traditional and new forms of cooperation.

The meeting was held in an amicable, businesslike and constructive atmosphere. Taking part were: Otto Wolf von Amerongen, president of the Association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry; representatives of major banks and concerns, including Dresdner Bank, Deutsche Bank, Ruhrgaz, Mannesman, Volkwagen, BASK; and the heads of many medium and small firms cooperating with Soviet organizations and enterprises.

Further on Ryzhkov's Official Visit to Norway

Departs Sweden for Norway

LD141353 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 14 Jan 88

[Text] Goteborg January 14 TASS—Nikolay Ryzhkov, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and accompanying officials in the second half of the day Thursday left for Norway.

At the Landvetter Airport Ryzhkov was seen off by Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson and other officials.

The farewell party included Boris Pankin, Soviet ambassador to Sweden.

Met by Brundtland

LD141521 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 14 Jan 88

[Text] Oslo January 14 TASS—Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov today arrived for an official visit in Norway. At Oslo's Fornebu International Airport decked out with state flags of the USSR and Norway, the distinguished Soviet guest was met by Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, other officials.

The Soviet-Norwegian talks opened in the Government House.

Visits Oslo Monuments

LD151252 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] The official visit of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov to Norway continues. This morning he laid a wreath at the monument of the Soviet soldiers who gave their lives in the struggle against fascism. A wreath was laid also at the monument of antifascist heories, participants in the resistance movement who died during the war years.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov today visited the museum complex of the Norwegian capital, where the boats of the Vikings, of Amundsen, the brave conqueror of the South Pole, and the rafts of the explorer Heyerdahl are kept. The director of the museum acquainted the head of the Soviet Government with these exhibits, which have become true relics not just for Norwegians but for the people of all countries.

Visits Norwegian Parliament

LD151424 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Oslo January 15 TASS—Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, today paid a visit to Norway's Storting (parliament) and conferred with its president Josef Benkow.

He met there also with members of the Storting's foreign policy and constitutional committees and the leaders of the major political parties of Norway. The MP's asked him about the progress of the restructuring drive in the Soviet Union and its impact on the world situation.

A wide range of issues related to international affairs and bilateral relations was discussed. Note was taken of the sides' interest in further developing and consolidating contacts between the two countries, including contacts between their parliaments.

Accords Signed

LD151825 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Oslo January 15 TASS—Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland of Norway today signed bilateral intergovernmental agreements on prompt notification of nuclear accidents and exchanges of information about nuclear installations, on cooperation in environmental protection, and on cooperation in searching for those missing and rescuing those in distress in the Barents Sea.

An agreement was signed between the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and the Norwegian Research Council for Natural Sciences on scientific and technological cooperation in the Arctic and the north.

Another cooperation agreement was signed between the Foreign Economic Bank of the USSR and Norway's Institute for Export Credits.

Embassy Reception Held

LD152218 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1940 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Oslo, 15 Jan (TASS)—During the afternoon a reception was held in the Soviet Embassy in Norway on the occasion of N.I. Ryzhkov's official visit to Norway.

Attending the reception were G. Harlem Brundtland, prime minister of Norway; J. Benkow, chairman of the Storting, statesmen, politicians, public figures, and representatives of business circles.

Dinner Speeches Given

PM190907 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Stay in Norway"]

[Text] Oslo, 15 Jan—A dinner was given on the Norwegian Government's behalf in honor of N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who has come here on an official visit, in the banqueting hall of ancient Akershus Castle Thursday evening. Present at the dinner were the persons accompanying the Soviet head of government, deputies of the Norwegian Storting (parliament), members of the government, public figures, and representatives of business circles.

Norwegian Prime Minister G. Harlem Brundtland delivered a speech at the dinner.

G. Harlem Brundtland's Speech [subhead]

Mr Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Mrs Ryzhkova, Ladies and Gentlemen!

It gives me great pleasure to cordially welcome you, Mr Chairman of the Council of Ministers, your wife, and all the other Soviet guests to this festive dinner in Akershus Castle. The Norwegian Government regards your visit as an important link in the cause of further political contacts between our governments and of strengthening cooperation between our countries.

We followed with great interest your visit to our neighbor Sweden, and we evaluate its results as positive confirmation that it is perfectly possible, given the active desire of both sides, to reach an accord on complex, vexed questions.

I personally intend to continue the line begun during our talks in Moscow in December 1986. We hope that your visit will lay the foundations for more regular political contacts and talks. We are proud of our country, which extends for hundreds of kilometers. In western Norway, you will see how the traditions of our nation of fishermen and seafarers are continuing even now. The development of the Norwegian economy is now closely linked with the utilization of the continental shelf's resources. Activity in extracting and processing oil in the northern regions is developing under difficult conditions, which are making still greater demands on technology, safety, and environmental protection—which is a determining factor in shaping Norway's policy on opening up the shelf's resources.

Your visit is taking place at a time when political contacts between our parliaments and governments are becoming increasingly active and the traditional spheres of cooperation are developing positively. On Friday we will sign agreements on questions of environmental protection, rescue at sea, warning of nuclear accidents at nuclear power stations, and in the sphere of polar research. These are very important issues, above all for life and activity in northern regions.

Our trade has not yet reached the volume that should be natural between neighboring countries with such longstanding traditions of cooperation as exist between Norway and the Soviet Union. Here we must on both sides take the reins of government into our own hands, remembering at the same time the words of B. Franklin, who said that not a single state has yet suffered as a result of trade.

Your visit is taking place at a time when new, positive prospects have opened up in East-West relations. The Washington summit meeting confirms that the Soviet Union and the United States can hold constructive talks on a wide range of important problems. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles marks a breakthrough in the cause of destroying nuclear arsenals. Norway fully supports the desire of the USSR and the United States to reduce the sides' strategic offensive arms by half. At the same time, we attach decisive significance to the fact that the talks on the balance of conventional armed forces and arms and on stability in Europe should produce the speediest results. Now, as previously, Norway advocates a chemical weapons ban.

Much still has to be done. But the positive atmosphere that has been created in East-West relations opens up far-reaching prospects in other spheres not directly concerned with disarmament. It is important that the present development should yield weighty results in spheres concerning our countries' citizens. This concerns human rights affecting individuals and the war in Afghanistan. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country will create a better basis for mutual trust between East and West. Therefore, we joyfully welcomed the Soviet side's statements that the Soviet troops will be withdrawn from that country.

As a country allied with the United States and neighboring on the Soviet Union, Norway is very interested in stable relations between East and West and in the maintenance of the lowest possible balance of their forces. There is a broad political unity of opinions in our country with regard to the need to maintain reliable defenses and to the fact that Norway's contribution must help to strengthen stability and tranquillity in the regions adjacent to us. This is precisely how we regard our policy in the security sphere within the framework of our country's involvement in the Western defensive alliance.

We in Norway are following with positive interest the broad debate relating to the process of transformations in the Soviet economy and society. The "new thinking" in foreign policy reflects the increased link between our countries and peoples. National interests must now be viewed in connection with general global interests. We are faced with many tasks in such important spheres as the economy, the environment, and power generation, demanding interaction and cooperation, regardless of our traditional economic and political realities.

Mr Chairman of the Council of Ministers, the historic halls of Akershus Castle have witnessed many events in Norwegian history. At the same time, this reminds us that our relations today are a continuation of 1,000 years of history marked by peaceful good-neighborliness.

A struggle is waged between our two countries only in the world sports arena. Soviet sportsmen, particularly in winter sports, are always welcome guests of ours, even though they win prizes from our sportsmen. Winter sports are so popular in Norway that when B. Shelkov, the outstanding Soviet speed skater, set a fantastic world record over 5,000 meters in 1955, it was almost as sensational as the launch of the first artificial satellite. Sportsmen such as N. Gulyayev, G. Kasparov, and R. Smetanina are just as much an inalienable part of our daily life as P. Tchaikovskiy, L. Tolstoy, and A. Chekhov in our cultural life.

Throughout our history, we have always resolved border questions peacefully. The oldest document reflecting our ties concerns precisely border relations and trade in the north. This obliges us to continue to follow the traditions of good-neighborliness, which are a unique phenomenon even in European ties. The question of the demarcation line in the Barents Sea is now on the agenda. In our government's opinion, the resolution of the question of a clear-cut and mutually acceptable border line would be of considerable positive value for strengthening relations of cooperation between Norway and the Soviet Union on a broad basis.

In 1326 the prince of Novgorod and the king of Denmark and Norway held the first talks on the border in the north. They candidly emphasized that they left the question of borders to the discretion of God Himself and the king of Norway and that they resolved it "in accordance with their own desire and conscience."

We do not insist that this principle can be used in full in the present situation, but we cannot resist the temptation to introduce into the recollection of our old history the good spirit that used to characterize our talks. We hope that you will take away positive impressions of our country, our political democracy, and the well-being our people have achieved, thanks to dogged work.

In conclusion, the Norwegian prime minister proposed a toast in honor of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and peace, cooperation, and friendship between the Soviet Union and Norway and the two countries' peoples.

Then N.I. Ryzhkov delivered a speech.

N.I. Ryzhkov's Speech [subhead]

Esteemed Mrs Prime Minister, Esteemed Ladies and Gentlemen!

Thank you for inviting me to visit your country and for the attention and the hospitality we have felt since the first minutes of our stay in Norway.

I am pleased to convey to you, Mrs Prime Minister, cordial greetings and good wishes from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who has fond memories of his meeting with you in Moscow, which took place in a friendly, frank atmosphere. I must say that here, in Norway, we sense an atmosphere that disposes toward mutual understanding and has a positive effect on the shoots of trust between our countries.

I believe that the roots which give life to these shoots can be seen both in the traditions of the more than 1,000-year history of our relations and in the warming of the general international climate. Here I would like particularly to emphasize the prospects opening up as a result of the signing of the treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles.

Speaking of history, it must be recalled that the enshrinement of the oldest border in our country—and also in the whole of Europe—in a treaty dates from 1251, from the times of Prince Aleksandr Nevski and King Haakon IV the Old. It has for centuries been a border of peaceful intercourse between our peoples. During the years of World War II, it was sanctified by our compatriots' blood shed in the struggle against a common enemy.

I must say that the Soviet people's image of Norway has largely been formed from the magnificent music of E. Grieg, the profoundly philosophical works of H. Ibsen, and the life-asserting exploits of R. Amundsen and F. Nansen. A unique fact: in 1922 the Moscow City Soviet elected F. Nansen an honorary member as a token of respect for him.

In the most recent history of our relations, the past 2 decades have not been mirror-smooth. At times the effect of alien sand has been felt in them, which has slowed down the onward development of our cooperation. It is important that we have succeeded, as a rule, in smoothing the unevenness, and from the viewpoint of the two countries' interests the overall balance of our relations may be considered positive.

The Soviet leaders' talks with Prime Minister Harlem Brundtland in Moscow in December 1986 denoted the possibility of a turn for the better in Soviet-Norwegian relations and outlined ways to move toward that goal. This is realism, mutual respect for each other's interests, and the development of mutually useful cooperation, in the course of which trust is born and strengthens, the "image of the enemy" collapses, and its place is taken by the image of a partner. In other words, the political "environment" is improving, and this demands no less persistence and purposefulness than those with which you have been working, Mrs Prime Minister, for the sake of preventing a global ecological catastrophe. Then the good-neighborly relations between the USSR and Norway will become an effective factor for stability in northern Europe and on the European Continent as a whole. The preconditions for this exist: historical, political, economic, and common to all mankind.

The signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is rightly regarded throughout the world as a historic step on the way to real nuclear disarmament. For the USSR, the United States, and many other countries and peoples, it is the first step toward a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, the total removal of the threat of war from the life of mankind, and the realization of the program advanced by M.S. Gorbachev exactly 2 years ago for the elimination of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons by the year 2000. This is a great success for joint constructive efforts, a common success for the USSR and the United States, but also, at the same time, a success for their allies. It is our common victory.

The chief thing now is to safeguard the world against attempts to slow down the process that has begun and together to endeavor to ensure further progress toward real disarmament. Only new accords—on strategic offensive arms and the prevention of weapons in space, on chemical weapons, on ending nuclear tests and reducing conventional armed forces and arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals—can make the process that has begun irreversible. I believe, Mrs Prime Minister, that we have a right to say that our governments' goals on these cardinal issues of the present day mainly coincide. We do not disagree that the methods for achieving them must be sought in joint actions by the governments and peoples of all countries.

I cannot fail to emphasize that the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles also gives a strong boost to the resolution of a problem such as the radical lowering of the level of military confrontation in the north, in the Arctic. From our viewpoint the strategic program proposed by M.S. Gorbachev in Murmansk for strengthening security and cooperation in the region provides a good basis for movement in this direction. The Murmansk program is an appeal to all our neighbors—in and near the Arctic—to think and act together. We value the Norwegian leadership's positive assessments of these initiatives and your public's interest in them.

A proposal to all interested states to embark on talks on limiting and reducing the scale of military activity in the north as a whole—in both the Eastern and the Western Hemisphere—resounded from Murmansk.

The resolution of this problem is obviously being hindered by the burden of mutual mistrust that has accumulated over the years. If we want to rid ourselves of it, let us pass from words to deeds. The Soviet Union has repeatedly demonstrated its readiness to act in this way. Now, just as in Stockholm a few days ago, we would like to focus attention on some new proposals along the lines of concretizing the Murmansk program.

There is our invitation to northern countries to send observers to one of the Soviet naval exercises in 1988. There is also our proposal to activate work on resolving the problem of radically lowering the level of military confrontation in the region and to make the question of limiting and reducing the scale of military activity in the north a subject for examination at the second stage of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. Taking the north Europeans' wishes into account, we are prepared to include the Barents Sea also in the zone of confidence-building measures at sea.

In order to get moving the question of consultations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO on confidence-building measures in the naval sphere, we propose holding a meeting of military experts of the two military-political alliances by way of preparing for these consultations. I believe this will make it easier to find mutually acceptable approaches. It is now up to our partners. It would be possible to organize a meeting of experts quite quickly, if political will is shown.

In consultations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO and at the Leningrad meeting proposed by us, we would be prepared to reach agreement on the following:

—to limit the number of large-scale naval and air force exercises held in the said sea regions to one exercise every 2 years;

—to create in the North and West Atlantic, for the USSR and the United States respectively, agreed regions in which actions by antisubmarine forces and means of the military-political alliances must be prohibited;

—to renounce on a mutual basis the holding of naval exercises in regions of the main ocean and sea trade routes in the North Atlantic, as well as in regions of intensive seasonal fishing;

—not to permit the concentration of naval groupings in international straits or the approaches to them, and also to define the maximum parameters of these groupings in terms of the number and classes of ships and other characteristics;

—to include in the zones of limitation the Baltic straits (the Store Baelt, the Lille Baelt, the Oresund, and the Skagerrak), the Denmark Strait, the English Channel, and the Iceland-Faeroe Islands-Scandinavia region.

In light of the positive trends that have become apparent in the international situation, the preconditions for resolving the question of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe also appear more favorable now. Confirming its readiness to act as a guarantor of a nuclear-free north, the Soviet Union advocates holding a constructive exchange of opinions on all aspects of this zone's problems with representatives of north European countries.

I would like to emphasize once again that the Murmansk initiatives, which absorbed many ideas from government and public circles in other countries, particularly our northern neighbors, are for us a long-term platform for improving the situation and for broad peaceful cooperation in the extensive and important northern region. So we see you as partners in cooperation in both the final shaping and the implementation of this program.

An active political dialogue and, chiefly, practical deeds must help us all overcome the lack of trust that has built up in a region that is so sensitive from the viewpoint of security interests. This is the most reliable way to organize profound interaction here, in both multilateral and bilateral peaceful cooperation. It is also the most realistic way to seek a solution to a problem such as the demarcation of sea spaces and the continental shelf in the Barents Sea.

Having reexamined in a comprehensive and unprejudiced way the protracted situation that has taken shape at the demarcation talks, we have reached the conclusion that the solution must be prepared on the basis of a considered assessment of the situation and on regard for and understanding of the local and global interests that come together here in the form of a multiple intersection. Basing ourselves on our countries' mutual interest in economic cooperation and in opening up the promising resources of the shelf of the Barents Sea, we would be prepared to discuss the question of turning that region into a special zone of trust and equitable partnership, whose configuration would not harm our countries' principled positions on the issue of the demarcation of sea spaces.

I would particularly like to dwell on the subject of environmental protection, which is close to you personally, Mrs Prime Minister. We all know what an outstanding role you play in international efforts in this sphere. No one must have any doubts about the fact that it is necessary to act collectively here on a world scale and in individual regions, and neighboring countries must do so in a good-neighborly way. In this connection, this thought from the report of the International Environment and Development Commission, which you head, is imprinted on my soul. Those who are allowing the environment to be spoiled today are in fact borrowing oxygen and the purity of nature from our children and grandchildren, from as yet unborn generations. If urgent and effective measures are not taken now, this debt could prove impossible to repay, and world civilization would not forgive us for such a thing. Therefore, we wholeheartedly advocate cooperation, and cooperation again, in the area of ecology, including between our two countries.

We see that in the light of the restructuring of all aspects of Soviet society's life, including the mechanism of our foreign economic ties, and the Soviet Union's involvement in the international division of labor, the interest of Norwegian business circles in a partnership on new principles has increased appreciably. We have this interest, too. We are prepared to cooperate but, of course, on a fair, nondiscriminatory basis.

In setting ourselves the task of expanding the volume and range of mutual trade, we must admit that for a number of objective reasons the traditional potential for growth has mainly exhausted itself. One way out suggests itself—to stimulate movement in large-scale cooperation projects, such as the comprehensive program for processing the Kola Peninsula's mineral resources, the opening up of the Barents Sea shelf, and the creation of joint enterprises in various spheres.

Turning to past experience, realism in assessments of the present, and commonality of long-term goals are a suitable basis for the further progressive development of Soviet-Norwegian relations.

In conclusion, I invite you with pleasure, Mrs Prime Minister, to pay a visit to our country. I wish you and your family health and successes, and the entire Norwegian people prosperity and peace in our common European home.

Departs Oslo, Arrives in Moscow

PM191215 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report under the rubric "Reports From Abroad": "Visit Concluded"]

[Text] On 16 January N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who has been in Norway on an official visit, left Oslo for home. N.I. Ryzhkov was seen off at the airport by Gro Harlem Brundtland and other officials.

Those present included A.V. Teterin, Soviet ambassador to Norway.

At Moscow's Vnukovo Airport N.I. Ryzhkov was met by L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom; N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; B.Ye. Shcherbina, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; M.S. Smirtyukov, USSR Council of Ministers administrator of affairs; Soviet ministers; and other officials.

Those present also included L.-O. Nilsson, Swedish charge d'affaires ad interim to the Soviet Union, and R. Baltzersen, Norwegian charge d'affaires ad interim to the Soviet Union.

In addition to the head of the Soviet Government, the following officials who accompanied him also returned: Soviet ministers V.A. Dinkov and L.D. Ryabev; USSR first deputy ministers A.G. Kovalev and V.L. Malkevich; Tsentrosoyuz Board Chairman P.S. Fedirko; and Murmansk Oblispolkom Chairman Yu.Z. Balakshin.

Bruntland Cables Ryzhkov En Route to PRC

LD190750 Moscow TASS in English 0746 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, flying above Soviet territory on her way to Beijing, has sent a telegram to Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The Norwegian prime minister highly assessed the results of the exclusively positive and friutful talks they held in Norway on January 14-16.

Gro Harlem Brundtland described the visit as an important contribution to promoting good relations between the two countries and expected continuation of the dialogue.

Current Norwegian Concerns Assessed

PM141533 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent N. Ivanov: "The Road North"]

[Excerpt] Oslo—[Passage omitted] What do Norwegians think about today; what landmarks are they seeking? One of them is convergence with the Common Market. The government makes no secret of the fact that 1992 could be a decisive year in the EEC debate. The chief argument is that 70% of the country's exports go to the Community. The other is the fear of remaining on the sidelines of West European integration, dictated by Norwegians' desire to avoid one-sidedness, politically as well as economically.

The reputation of being a "diligent pupil of the United States" has never been a source of gratification; then again, nor has it ever offended ordinary Norwegians. In everything to do with foreign policy, the differences between the leading parties' programs have always been as small as can be. This is a feature of Norway, a country with a population of 4 million and a varied history. Today the social democratic government unreservedly confirms its loyalty to NATO and to its transatlantic partner. This is a fact that cannot be ignored, just as one cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that in the 40 years since the war, the northernmost part of Norway has been turned into a NATO strong point.

At the same time, mention must also be made of the new mood in the Norwegians' consciousness which does not fit the conventional framework of bloc doctrine. A recent poll showed that one-third of the inhabitants believe M.S. Gorbachev is doing more to halt the arms race than R. Reagan. It would have been impossible to imagine that 5 or 6 years ago.

J. Ausland, a former U.S. diplomat who worked for a long time in Oslo, considers that the time has come for a reappraisal: "Norwegians are beginning to look openly and without prejudice at the Soviet Union...." He cited several facts which, in his view, have not helped to improve relations with Washington, in particular, Norway's reluctance to participate in the SDI program. One could add to that the fact that Norway backs the idea of a nuclear-free north and follows, albeit with certain reservations, the principles of not stationing foreign military bases and nuclear weapons on its territory in peacetime. Norway is extremely wary of the Pentagon's new plans to expand its military presence in the Norwegian Sea and was sympathetic toward the well-known "Murmansk initiatives." Foreign Minister T. Stoltenberg described M.S. Gorbachev's proposal as a serious invitation to a serious dialogue.

Norwegian businessmen also intend to conduct a serious dialogue. Norway was the first Scandinavian country to sign a provisional trade agreement with us. Since then there have been ups and downs, creating serious problems for business contacts. The highest point reached by trade in recent years was more than R200 million in 1984. But even in that period, we did not exceed 1% of Norway's foreign trade turnover.

USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov's upcoming visit is seen by local political and business cirlces as a significant event. "It is exceedingly important that we should be making contact with our neighbor at a high political level," G. Harlem Brundtland said. I recall that the last time the head of the Soviet Government paid a visit to Oslo was 17 years ago. Norwegian Premier T. Bratteli paid an official visit to us in 1974. So there are grounds for talking about a new momentum in Soviet-Norwegian relations.

Political & Social

Zaykov Speaks on Moscow's Development

PM181055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jan 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Looking Boldly to the Future"]

[Text] An integrated master plan for the capital and its oblast for the period through 2010 is being elaborated in line with the CPSU Central Committee Politburo-approved concept for Moscow's comprehensive socioeconomic development.

A 9 January session of the public council for urban development attended by architects, designers, builders, economists, the heads of party, soviet, and social organizations in the city and the Moscow region, and representatives of ministries and departments discussed the main aspects of economic and social development in the Moscow region.

This document formulates the main tasks involved in developing Moscow and its oblast as a unified national economic complex with regard to ensuring the proportioned development of the production and non-production spheres, further increasing and making more effective use of the powerful scientific, technical and cultural potential created here, improving Muscovites' standard of living, and enhancing their living, working, and leisure conditions.

The session was addressed by L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom. Work on formulating the master plan, he said, has reached the crucial stage where the basic technical and economic indicators which will determine the future of the region are being established. They must embody in specific terms the 27th CPSU Congress directives regarding the acceleration of socioeconomic development. This work is proceeding at a time that is extremely important to our country, when the fate of restructuring is being determined by the solution to such interconnected tasks as improving the people's well-being, democratizing social life, and implementing fundamental economic reform. While laying the foundations for the future, we must really ensure that Muscovites can see tangible improvements as soon and as fully as possible. That is why work on the master plan must begin and end with realization of the human factor and concern for people.

The main attention must be devoted to the question of balancing labor resources, ways to solve the housing problem, and the development of sectors making up the social infrastructure. We are making the transition to comprehensive planning, whereby we commission complete city districts which fully satisfy people's need for children's and medical institutions, trade and public catering enterprises, and consumer services rather than individual projects. We are moving away from the practice of formally planning a certain number of square meters of housing in favor of planning a specific number of apartments in order to unconditionally fulfill the task set by the party of solving the housing problem. In so doing we must not work on the basis of present obsolete norms for providing the population with housing, sociocultural facilities, and consumer services but orient ourselves toward future requirements.

The master plan must provide a solution to the transport problem, which is very important to people living in Moscow and the oblast. It is essential to create an efficient, interlinked transport system, ensure the optimum passenger transportation structure, and incorporate new forms of transport in the projects.

Public health and environmental protection are subjects of particular concern. It is essential to ensure the modernization and development of medical institutions. Strengthening the material and technical base of spiritual and physical culture must be provided for.

Attention must be focused on ways to solve the food problem and ensure steady food supplies to people living in the capital and the Moscow region. With this aim in mind the agro-industrial complex and the entire trade system must be developed in a balanced, integrated manner.

The economic and social development of the region in the period through 2010 will be achieved by enhancing labor productivity. The key to this lies mainly in developing science-intensive sectors and retooling and modernizing existing enterprises. Combining territorial and sectorial planning on the basis of long-term requirements and implementing an integrated program of social production intensification in Moscow and the region will make it possible to increase the region's contribution to the solution of statewide tasks.

Special attention must be devoted to the center of Moscow and other important architectural monuments in the city and the region. During their redevelopment and modernization greater care must be taken to preserve existing ensembles and more extensive use should be made of individual projects for residential buildings and social centers.

The formulation of the general plan, L.N. Zaykov emphasized, is now the pivot of organizational and political work. It requires a reliable scientific foundation, the involvement of the best creative forces, and the use of the best urban development experience accumulated here and abroad. The quality of this work will be decided by the dynamism, competence, and responsibility of everyone concerned.

The session emphasized that the Moscow gorispolkom and oblispolkom must more actively involve the public in the formation of the new general plan. Now, when scientific and draft planning organizations have become economically accountable, it is important to ensure that their projects consider working people's opinions and do not have to be radically altered in the future. All suggestions and comments by working people will be carefully studied when working on this important document. A center has been formed under the auspices of the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Architectural and Planning Administration for the purpose of generalizing these suggestions and comments.

Senior officials from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Gosplan, and the USSR Gosstroy took part in the session.

Samarkand Obkom Plenum Reported

PM151009 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 12 Jan 88 p 2

[Report by "our special correspondents" I. Medovoy and Vil. Niyazmatov: "Difficult Path to Frankness; Samarkand Uzbekistan Communist Party Obkom Plenum Has Discussed the Bureau Report on the Leadership of Restructuring"]

[Text] Samarkand—Late in the evening, when only a few hours remained before the plenum, we asked Nazir Radzhabov: What hopes did he, as first secretary of the party obkom, link with tomorrow's event, and what did he expect from the plenum?

"I except frank discussion," Radzhabov replied. "We must learn to speak the truth to each other."

Yes, many of the people with whom we talked that evening were awaiting the plenum impatiently and linked great hopes with it. Not only because a new man had come to lead the oblast party organization (Nazir Radzhabov was only recently elected first secretary of the party obkom) but also because the oblast had accumulated very acute social problems and the forthcoming plenum could become the point of departure in resolving them.

Nigmatzhon Sadykov, Samarkand's chief architect, told us with anguish about, for instance, the extremely incompetent leadership of culture. So far Samarkand has been treated as an ordinary city. This has been manifested in the construction of new apartments, in the attitude toward the legacy of our ancestors, and in much else. Often the city has been the object of arbitrary interference by party and soviet leaders. For instance, the old quarters opposite the old Registan have been demolished and ordinary five-story apartment blocks have been constructed in their place. At the wish of the former oblispolkom chairman the ancient wall of Tamurlane's citadel was demolished—as much as 40 meters of the wall were destroyed. In its place they constructed... a garage. Architects tried to protect the monument and appealed to the party obkom—and found no support.

The ancient land renowned for its unique historical monuments, culture, and labor traditions, now has a different, most unfortunate, renown.

Gross distortions of the Leninist norms and principles of party life, exaggerated reports, embezzlements, bribery, an atmosphere of lies and immorality, the violation of the principles of social justice—all this has flourished here for decades. In the oblast's agriculture only three leaders have remained who have been at their present posts for more than 5 years. The majority have been arrested for various crimes. For the past 2 years the oblast has failed to cope with state plans. During the stagnation period powerful forces formed to resist the party's policy, forces based on corruption, local favoritism, and nepotism. For many years the concealed forces of secret ties acted to the detriment of society.

The party and soviet organs received a constant flow of letters from working people speaking of lawlessness, abuses, the suppression of criticism, and a bureaucratic, formal attitude toward citizens' needs. In the past 2 years alone the party obkom has examined over 30,000 such letters.

In brief, more than enough "black holes" accumulated in the oblast during the years of stagnation. How to combat this many-faced evil? Nazir Radzhabov is clearly aware that you cannot do it at a stroke. Combating stagnation, the obkom first secretary says, is possible only when people are transformed from a passive or sympathetic mass into the main force of restructuring. An extremely frank talk at the plenum could be the detonator to the process of democratization.

It must be admitted that the obkom bureau report differed markedly from the reports of previous years: It outlined the oblast's life in quite harsh tones. There was also mention of the catastrophic decline in the efficiency of agricultural production, the unstable work of industry, and the dissipation of funds in construction. In 1987 alone, the speaker noted, 23 enterprises reduced their production volume compared with last year by over R67 million. In the first 11 months of 1987 labor productivity in industry dropped 2.5%. But wages continued to grow. The total sum of the debts of kolkhozes and sovkhozes was about R223 million. In the past 4 years cotton procurement plans have been disrupted—there has been a shortfall of about 400,000 tonnes.

Figures were also cited attesting to trouble in the social and cultural spheres. In terms of consumer services and the production of consumer goods the oblast ranks bottom in Uzbekistan. There are no consumer services at all in nearly 450 hamlets. Over half the medical institutions have no central water supply and only one third have sewerage.

The speaker also emphasized the abundance of violations of state discipline and abuses by Communists. In the course of 2 years 1,670 were reprimanded for unseemly actions and abuses and 730 were expelled from the party.

... Some 23 people spoke in the debates. I. Atakurbanov, director of the "Karnab" karakul sheep breeding sovkhoz, spoke vividly and graphically of how the incompetence of the planning organs, obsolete instructions, and bureaucratic obstacles are an impediment in the leader's work. He expressed the idea that it is necessary for all leaders, irrespective of rank, to think in economic terms.

"I consider the obkom bureau's work to be satisfactory if we greatly stretch the point," I. Ishbekov, secretary of the Kattakurgan party gorkom, said. "Let's finally agree once and for all to use the party rostrum for deeds, not words, not promises which are not fulfilled afterwards!"

The speech delivered by E. Gafurzhanov, first secretary of the Samarkand party gorkom, also attracted attention. He described instances of corruption and lawlessness occurring to this day. In his opinion this is happening because the obkom apparatus is obviously backsliding in the restructuring process.

"A special type of leader—the swindler—has appeared," E. Gafurzhanov said. "I should like to draw his social portrait in a general way. He is a man who is helped in climbing the career ladder by his influential connections and his relations' heavy purse. He is often the first to grasp the external aspect of transformations, and makes active use of the latest political phraseology, but he is concerned with just one thing: how, while being idle himself, to create the impression that he is an efficient, creatively minded, modern worker. Many swindlers have penetrated the party apparatus. Last year employees of the city's finance department checked several museums. They established that some workers were drawing unearned income. They compiled a document. The next day the chief of the city finance department was invited to the party obkom propaganda and agitation department. The responsible worker who talked with him was by no means interested in the details of the check. Just one thing perturbed him—how to smooth over the incident and 'put the brakes on' the criminal facts revealed. I described this scandalous incident to F. Shukurova, party obkom secretary for ideology. I cannot say that my report delighted her. The above-mentioned worker was expelled from the obkom. But everything was done quietly, without noise...."

Those were 3 speeches out of 23. They have stayed in our minds most of all. But, truth to tell, it was by no means these speeches which set the tone of the plenum. Because as a whole the frank talk on which our interlocutors had been counting so much failed to materialize. To say there was no frankness at all would be to sin against the truth. It was present in the report and the subsequent speeches. But its level was low. The revelations were of a regretful and fact-stating nature.

Some speakers got away with general phrases, others reported on themselves (and they were the majority), while others engaged in self-flagellation—this procedure, despite the seeming trenchancy of the phrases hurled from the rostrum, was not taken seriously by those sitting in the auditorium. There was a whiff of the times of stagnation from the assessment of the report heard in one of the very first speeches, which described it as "acute, wise, and principled." Figures—rubles, tonnes, weight gains, milk yields—poured out as if from a horn of plenty. But perhaps least of all was said about the most important thing—how to accomplish restructuring.

Criticism was leveled most frequently with an enormous number of qualifications, following the notorious formula "if someone somewhere sometimes." The result was that the speaker would load the auditorium with problems and seem to speak passionately and angrily but in the auditorium there was a weary fidgeting, people lost in day dreaming, whispering, smiling....

The auditorium fell silent when they announced the speech by D. Agzamov, chief of the Samarkand Oblispolkom internal affairs administration. Understandably: An hour before the report had mentioned the crime surge. In the past 2 years not a single deliberate homicide, not a single rape or mugging from previous years has been solved and 1,700 crimes remain unsolved to this day.

But the militia major general, speaking of petty criminals, automobile thefts, minor embezzlements, and drunkenness, made no specific proposals as to how to rectify the situation.

I think the reason why the expected degree of frankness in the plenum speeches failed to materialize lies in the tone of the report, which also defined the nature of the ensuing talk. Yes, there was more than enough criticism in the report. But this criticism was more than merciful toward the leaders responsible for a particular disruption. "Ruined" work sectors were named. But the most ordinary conclusions were drawn from criticism: "Obkom Secretary Comrade M.A. Umarov is obviously leading this sector in an inadequate way. The experience he has of economic and party work gives us grounds for demanding persistent work from him." Obkom Bureau member Comrade A.A. Yuldashev is personally responsible for stockraising. As a specialist he is very skilled and knowledgeable. His position is simply incomprehensible. We demand resolute work from him..."

Speaking of serious shortcomings in the ideological sphere, the speaker said: "Party Obkom Bureau member and Secretary Comrade F.A. Shukurova is responsible for this work sector. She is a capable person, she must be supported in her undertakings and given assistance..." We will quote once more from the report: "Comrade R.N. Ishimov, candidate member of the party Obkom Bureau, must display character, simplicity, great diligence, and fervor..." Really, when you hear such characterizations you cannot help thinking that the person is not being criticized for his failings but praised.

The plenum said more than ever about the shortcomings and breakdowns in the economy and the sociocultural sphere. In this it differed favorably from the plenums of previous years. But nowadays it is not enough merely to draw a gloomy picture of disintegration. The task of the day is to seek ways of advancing. Criticism should be constructive. Only then is it possible to set in motion the mechanism of democratization—the main motive force of restructuring.

The party obkom includes over 200 Communists of whom one-third are workers and ordinary rural workers. Yet it was, alas, only the "first men"—the obkom, raykom and gorkom secretaries, soviet workers, and economic leaders who spoke at the plenum, with the sole exception of milkmaid S. Alayarova, who read her speech without raising her eyes to look at the auditorium.

Enormous reserves for restructuring lie in the cultural sphere. Unfortunately, the obkom report only skimmed over this. Essentially the plenum participants did not mention it either. Yet culture in the oblast has been experiencing a prolonged crisis. Its material and technical base is weak. The majority of culture centers are situated in makeshift premises. Nearly 200 population centers, each with over 1,000 inhabitants, have no culture centers. The philharmonic orchestra has ceased to exist. Samarkand's four theatrical collectives have lost their former prestige. The building of the Khamid Alimdzhan drama theater is in a dilapidated state and the construction of a new building has been frozen. Because of this the theater has been unable to open a season for 3 years.

A large detachment of creative people—architects, artists, theatrical figures, writers, and composers, over 3,000 people in all—works in the oblast. And the party obkom should rely on them... But you form the impression that this reserve is as yet being used only feebly. Unfortunately the voices of representatives of the creative intelligentsia were not heard at the plenum.

... The Samarkand people have a great desire to overcome the sorry consequences of the stagnation phenomena. They are hoping that the exalted words uttered from the oblast plenum rostrum will be crowned with exalted deeds. But desire and the ability to see shortcomings are not enough on their own. As is well known, verbal water does not turn turbines.

"We need bold, honest people on whom we can rely," party Obkom First Secretary N. Radzhabov said in his concluding speech. "As of tomorrow let's begin work for the sake of our common cause—for the sake of restructuring. It really is worth working for it. Fewer words and more specific deeds!"

Speaker's Attack on Demirchyan Supported

PM181341 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 88 Second Edition p 3

[Report by special correspondents Yu. Arakelyan and V. Somov: "Trial of Conscience, or Some Facets of Life in Armenia"]

[Text] Armenian SSR—This speech did not win applause. Although all the previous speakers had been politely applauded. Kotandhzyan had hardly had time to return to his seat before hands were raised all around the hall. There was no end to those wanting to speak. They spoke with conviction, ardently, passionately. Anger and indignation, accusations and complaints—they all merged in a turbulent torrent which swept down on one man. He sat immobile for several hours, losing track of the time and the speakers (there were 24 of them). Only he knows what he felt and went through during those minutes.

The comments rained down from the platform of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum discussing a report from the Bureau on work on the leadership of restructuring:

"He has again tried to denigrate the great work done by our people"

"Adventurism is rearing its head in the guise of glasnost!"

"This is demagoguery, behind which lies personal ambitions and careerist motives!"

Then came the decision. It unanimously condemned G. Kotandzhyan's speech at the July (1987) and subsequent December plenums of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and expressed disagreement with the assessments contained in them. They were deemed erroneous and unfounded.

The opinion of such an authoritative body is more than weighty. Who could doubt its objectivity? Who would dare to dispute it? Surely not just Kotandzhyan himself.

Who in the final analysis is this Kotandzhyan whose speeches at two plenums now have been at variance with the republic Communist Party Central Committee's line? He is first secretary of Razdanskiy Party Raykom. He has not been in this job long—just over 6 months. When he stood up at the plenum last July, his experience as a secretary totaled 9 days. An upstart? An unbalanced man? Let us not jump to conclusions.

Let us try to sort out just what Gayk Sarkisovich said in public and for what he was condemned. He spoke about the corruption and protectionism which have afflicted various spheres of Armenia's life. About the selection of cadres on the basis of personal loyalty. About the "shadow" economy, which has assumed enormous dimensions, and the concomitant distortions and deformations of socialist relations. About the fact, finally, that the republic's working people constantly encounter social injustice and lack of legal and moral protection against corruption. G. Kotandzhyan placed the responsibility for the failures in the economy and the ideological and moral sphere on the Central Committee Bureau. In his words, what this discredits is restructuring. There is a need for a new leadership not encumbered with the burden of past mistakes. He then proposed that a new bureau be elected and that Central Committee First Secretary K. Demirchyan voluntarily transfer to different work.

We will make no secret of the fact that even quite recently Kotandzhyan is said to have described Demirchyan to a narrow circle of confidants as virtually a "father" to him. Furthermore, his extremely successful progress in his career has not been without Demirchyan's support and patronage. He headed the republic Komsomol organization and was deputy chief of a Central Committee department and State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education chairman. Some people have assessed Kotandzhyan's speeches at the last two plenums as an expression of disappointment at his new appointment. He was hoping for greater things, they say, but was offered only a raykom.

Kotandzhyan himself has a different explanation of the motives for his speeches:

"Back in July I did not believe I would turn out to be a black sheep. I had hoped many people would speak frankly. There didn't seem to be any other option. I believed the criticism leveled against Armenia at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum would have a sobering effect. Alas! We received a stream of routine orations listing the surnames of leaders who had not been devoting attention to some questions or other. This is a convenient formula when you want to create an impression of being critical. Everyone is to blame—and no one. There was virtually no discussion of the real moral and political situation in the republic. I realized I could remain silent no longer."

So he saw the light, did he? It would be naive to suppose that Kotandzhyan himself had not seen or known about the corruption, embezzlement, and figure padding. Of course he knew, but he remained silent and along with other Central Committee members continued to "play the conventional game" at plenums and conferences, confining himself to ersatz democracy and glasnost. But to level that complaint against him would be to fail to understand how a person, having overcome himself and stereotyped thinking, rose to a new level of understanding of what was happening around him.

Let us again listen to what Kotandzhyan has to say:

"For years Demirchyan's authority was unimpeachable. People believed in him and linked the onset of change and hopes with him. I considered myself to be under a great obligation to him. I was confident the Central Committee first secretary was implacable toward shortcomings and negative phenomena and was waging an unceasing struggle against them. Admittedly, in recent years I had repeatedly doubted the effectiveness of this struggle. But my first few days of work in the Razdanskiy Raykom finally opened my eyes to a great many things."

So what happened in those 9 days between Kotandzhyan's election as first secretary and the Central Committee plenum? Superficially nothing very much. Gayk Sarkisovich met with people. In addition, he was almost overwhelmed by a flood of telephone calls. His interlocutors talked nonstop about his predecessor, S. Daniyelyan. Sometimes he wanted to slam down the telephone or send his latest visitor away with a cry of "I don't believe it!" Although Daniyelyan had been released for shortcomings in work, Kotandhzyan could not have dreamed how far things had gone.

He was told that a "shadow tax collection system" operated in the rayon. There was a multitiered system of payment of "undercover taxes." The rank and file embezzlers shared it with their direct superiors, who in turn shared it with law enforcement officials. At the tip of the pyramid stood the party raykom. Kotandzhyan had heard in the past that such a system operated in the republic. He had both believed and disbelieved the rumors. But here he saw for himself how administrative organs were serving as an instrument to compel people involved in underground business dealings to pay up out of... fear. Or what was the worth of cadre policy, for example—if the word "policy" is at all appropriate here, of course? Positions were distributed for money, people told Kotandzhyan. There was even a scale of charges in operation.

All this was directly linked with the name of the former raykom first secretary. It was on his insistence, for example, that one S. Nikolyan was accepted as a CPSU candidate member. In the past he had been a trade worker sentenced for machinations. At the time he was due to become a candidate member of the party he was heading a subsidiary of a glove factory. It was only by chance (the chief of the records department was sick) that Nikolyan did not receive his candidate's card. Immediately afterward he was discovered to have been involved in large-scale theft, took to his heels, and on being captured was sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment. To cover up the "confusion" the minutes of a bureau session were changed on Daniyelyan's instructions and the criminal was retrospectively... refused admission.

The rayon buzzed like a beehive when commodity manager [tovaroved] R.A. Galstyan suddenly became director of a large greenhouse combine. The grapevine even reported the size of the bribe which Daniyelyan received. Maybe this was slander or provocation? One day (after he had been fired) Galstyan himself took the proof to the republic Communist Party Central Committee—a tape recording of his conversation with the first secretary. Listen to how I demanded my gold back, he said.

People openly told Kotandzhyan how openly idle his predecessor had been. He practically never visited villages or enterprises. The economy of the rayon, which had been a leading rayon even quite recently, had gone to rack and ruin. Yet the raykom bureau and its apparatus were totally passive and feeble. The first secretary, a rude and arrogant man, would not tolerate objections or complaints. Department chiefs considered themselves fortunate if they got through Daniyelyan's office door.

The end result? He was released for shortcomings in work and unprincipledness. Even the reprimand he got from the Central Committee Bureau was not entered on his record. Such leniency seemed blasphemous to Kotandzhyan. He also understood the source of it: Daniyelyan was later an assistant to the Central Committee first secretary.

A meek and quiet person, he had spent 7 years handing out paper and "sitting by the telephone." He was distinguished by servility and obsequiousness. He had no other particular perceptible qualities. But Daniyelyan was entrusted with heading a major rayon party organization.

Today people in the republic Communist Party Central Committee attempt to depict the Daniyelyan episode as a regrettable mistake. But, let us be clear, not everybody. Party Control Commission Chairman S. Khachatryan, for example, told us:

"Demirchyan was informed about the serious warnings and complaints about Daniyelyan. There was no reaction. The tape provided by Galstyan lay gathering dust in my safe for more than a year. Only recently were criminal proceedings instituted."

S. Khachatryan also spoke at the latest Central Committee plenum. Before Kotandzhyan... The debate had already been declared "closed," but they both insisted on being allowed to speak. They had not colluded, but they expressed essentially the same ideas. Sarkis Makarovich also noted the Central Committee Bureau's unprincipledness toward Daniyelyan. The reprimand had shielded him from proper punishment.

But surely this was not all? Central organs had also received sackloads of complaints about L. Nersesyan, former first secretary of the Yerevan party gorkom. People cannot understand why a man who had for a long time abused and denigrated the dignity of Communists was quietly and without any explanation transferred to the post of deputy chairman of the republic Council of Ministers and recently retired voluntarily.

In the words of the Party Control Commission chairman, graft had become incredibly widespread, particularly in the militia and other law enforcement organs. What worries Khachatryan most? Only the "small fry" get punished. Why is it that only they get caught, while the organizers of crime avoid responsibility? In response, people like to cite the proverb: You're only a thief when you get caught... And they are not getting caught. Who is going to do the catching when bribe takers and embezzlers of every stripe and rank at both rayon and republic level are bound tightly in a web of mutual protection?

Stop! Denouncing people is the easiest thing in the world. But where have the Party Control Commission and its leader been looking, so to speak?

"In the last 13 years we have not examined a single personal file of law enforcement officials," S. Khachatryan notes. "The Party Commission has not punished a single judge, prosecutor, or militia subdivision chief. Letters, warnings, and complaints about administrative organs sent to the Central Committee are deliberately not sent to the Party Commission by the leadership. I have repeatedly drawn the attention of Demirchyan and other secretaries to this. To no avail."

Khachatryan's principledness and honesty are common knowledge in the republic. His competence and ability to unravel the most complex knots are evidently feared. What if the thread leads in an undesired direction? It is hard to believe law enforcement organs have been placed beyond party supervision. But such are the facts. Is this not the source of the total license, corruption, and intertwining of "lawmen" and the criminal world? Is this not why the militia, the courts, and the prosecutor's office—painful though it is to write this—are the connecting link between underground business and certain party and soviet officials?

Every day hundreds of cars stand outside the buildings of the republic MVD, the city administration, and rayon militia departments in Yerevan. Belonging to people working for these institutions, they block the roadway and sidewalk while their owners are serving the law. The inhabitants of Yerevan, who observe this "car show" every day, have a mass of food for conversations about the dishonest acquisition of most of the vehicles. After all, the salary rates of militia workers are extremely modest. Incidentally, 4 years ago the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Party Control Commission decided to ascertain how far public opinion corresponded to the truth. According to republic MVD data, 667 cars were registered as being in the possession of Yerevan militia workers. Almost two-thirds of these had been obtained in the name of close relatives. Having visited the parking lots, commission members discovered another 596 cars which were not recorded in the lists submitted by the ministry. The commission then sent a corresponding communication to the MVD. It received no reply and led to no consequences.

There are consequences. They include people's complete lack of trust in law enforcement organ workers and, as a result, an incorrect and distorted notion of what is good and what is bad. This is where abuse of the law and morality leads.

In S. Khachatryan's view, the law is blind to the bosses of the "shadow economy." They are also beyond the reach of party justice. For example, many serious alerts are received about the embezzlement and squandering of funds at enterprises under the Ministry of Light Industry. The Party Commission's attempts to get the question examined by the Central Committee Bureau have repeatedly ended in failure. Yet the thefts discovered at just five Leninakan enterprises in 1 and 1/2 years exceed R2 million. Who there is protecting the embezzlers? Strange as it may seem, it is the party gorkom, which shields in every way leaders involved in crime. Even after being sentenced by a court some of them keep their party card. Is this known in the republic Communist Party Central Committee? Undoubtedly. But Leninakan has been and remains a zone where criticism is banned. Local journalists, incidentally, told us this.

In assessing the moral and political situation in the republic, we are a long way from portraying absolutely everything in the blackest of colors. The absolute majority of Armenian working people are honest people who conscientiously perform their duty. It is not their fault the process of democratization and renewal is meeting with fierce resistance from opponents of restructuring. People yearn for genuine changes. They are oppressed by the edgy, hyped-up atmosphere reigning in the republic. Many collectives, especially scientific and creative collectives, are rent by squabbling and petty conflicts.

But just you try to find out from the local newspapers what is going on in Armenia. You won't be able to do so. The most burning, acute problems are hushed up. People are forced to content themselves with rumors. For instance, spontaneous demonstrations in defense of the environment were held in Yerevan. The press did not mention them. Bitter arguments erupted at a republic Writers Union plenum, but the official report circulated to newspapers contained only bland formulas. Pressmen are poorly informed about the situation. Central Committee secretaries do not meet with editorial collectives. In recent years none of them has visited even KOMMUNIST, the republic's newspaper.

Perhaps the Central Committee Bureau is today taking measures to improve the situation and eliminate the major miscalculations in the economy and in the social and ideological spheres? Sessions here are rife with complacency and formalism. Most of the issues discussed are trivial and routine. Cadre appointments are usually made without discussion. Someone walks into the auditorium, his name is read out, and, there you go, he is the raykom secretary or ispolkom chairman. The impression emerges that the people at the meeting take no part in what is going on. The tendency to rely on personal likes and dislikes rather than on the party statutes and the law, the complacency, the lack of principle, and the lack of resolution only drive the "ailments" deeper inside.

Many vital, urgent problems of the republic's socioeconomic development remain unsolved, although considerable resources are expended. Central Committee Second Secretary Yu. Kochetkov frankly said this in conversation with us:

"Party workers have simply ceased to feel responsibility for the situation. A potentially fertile southern republic is unable to provide itself with fruit and vegetables. People are without water for days on end. But each year many millions of rubles are spent on water supply. Unfortunately, the braking mechanism is fully on."

S. Khachatryan said the same at the last Central Committee plenum. He mentioned the chief forces applying the braking mechanism. There is "the consolidation of nomenklatura officials—opponents of restructuring." His words were confirmed literally 10 minutes later, when dozens of loudmouthed speakers savaged (it's hard to pick any other description) G. Kotandzhyan, who had spoken next. The farcical denunciation of him as a "demagogue" and "careerist" was organized in advance. They had even decided who was to be the first person allowed to mount the rostrum. A worker, of course! It misfired, it's true: They'd overdone it. The speaker's gaze was riveted on his notes. But how could he have predicted that Kotandzhyan would speak at the plenum?!

The speakers did not dare deny the main point—the statements about corruption and other negative accretions. They "went for" Kotandzhyan himself. He "was not schooled in labor," he "has not properly acquired party work experience. Finally, A. Kandilyan, Yerevan Department chief of the Transcaucasus Railroad, went to far as to call Kotandzhyan a...schizophrenic. This is typical. The denouncers could not tolerate even the thought that a sane, sober-minded person would dare to move against the serried ranks of nomenklatura officials. It is not in vain that there were calls for Kotandzhyan to be removed from the Central Committee immediately and expelled from the party.

It was not Kotandzhyan that they were execrating but uncompromising attitudes, honesty, and party conscience. They were essentially cursing restructuring, which may prevent them from keeping their cushy jobs. The changes Kotandzhyan was calling for would inevitably shake up those jobs.

Kotandzhyan was "condemned," but (strangely?) not a single reproach was leveled at Khachatryan. Why? Khachatryan is perfectly aware of the situation in every rayon, city, and department. He has heaps of alarming reports. Better not cross swords with him!

Some time later we asked how Kotandzhyan's work was doing. Gayk Sarkisovich did not complain of the hassle and insults, but replied briefly:

"I didn't expect anything else."

We leafed through the many dozens of telegrams and letters from all over the republic. They all express support and gratitude for his courage.

"I don't regard myself as a hero," Kotandzhyan frowned. "But I don't want to be a villain."

...We visited the quietest and saddest corner of Leninakan—the cemetery. What did we see? Towering memorials to people who during their lifetimes had not been overly concerned with the public good. The most opulent and expensive were those of former sales assistants, warehousemen, and state automobile inspectorate officials...

There was a full-blown mausoleum in red granite. Experts claim the structure cost many tens of thousands of rubles. People do not hide their money after their death. The city prosecutor is buried there. Special respect is shown to the dead in Armenia. Their memory is regarded as sacred. But this tomb has been repeatedly desecrated. Is this vengeance for principledness and incorruptibility? No. The people respect and honor the dead for those qualities.

An elderly woman stopped next to us. She read the inscription on the stone, clearly remembered something, and her eyes glistened with tears that you would have thought had long been cried out. The woman's gaze expressed execration of those who have bartered their conscience for money, their dignity for valuable trinkets. We think every honest person will go along with that.

Foreign Trade Ministry, Committee Abolished

LD161540 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jan (TASS)—The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has formed the All-Union Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations of the USSR and has abolished the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade and the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet appointed Konstantin Katushev USSR minister of foreign economic relations.

Minister Retained

LD161513 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 16 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—Konstantin Katushev, b. 1927, has headed the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations instead of the abolished Ministry of Foreign Trade and the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations.

Konstantin Katushev embarked on his working career in 1951 at the motor works in the city of Gorkiy where he worked as designer and then deputy chief designer of a department.

Since 1957 he was a party functionary: was elected secretary of the a district party committee, secretary of the party committee of the Gorkiy motor works, first secretary of the Gorkiy city party committee, first secretary of the Gorkiy regional committee of the CPSU. He was secretary of the CPSU Central Committee between 1968 and 1977.

Between 1977 and 1982 he was deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Since 1982 Katushev was USSR ambassador to the Republic of Cuba and in November 1985 was appointed chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations.

TU-154 Crashes on Approach to Airport; 11 Dead

LD181610 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1540 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jan (TASS)—The newspaper IZVESTIYA reports that an aircrash occurred today at Krasnovodsk (a Soviet port city on the Caspian Sea) Airport at 0420 Moscow time.

Having received the 'OK' to land, the TU-154, which was on a flight from Moscow-Ashkhabad, approached the runway. Suddenly, right before everyone's eyes, it began to disintegrate. So far the reasons for the accident are not clear; they must be investigated by a special state commission.

The toll of the air crash is 11 dead and 12 injured, some seriously.

Immediately after the accident, writes the newspaper, urgent measures were made to evacuate the injured. Those hurt were taken to the city hospital. The situation at the airport is returning to normal.

Turkmen Official Comments

LD181728 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Excerpts] A TU-154 aircraft crashed at Krasnovodsk today. [passage omitted] Smirnov, the deputy head of Turkmen Civil Aviation Directorate, told an IZVESTIYA correspondent:

[Begin Smirnov recording] There is no accurate information so far. [passage omitted] It is hard to say for sure what happened. It may have been a technical fault. A commission will certainly establish the true cause of the disaster. This is not the first emergency at this airport. Seven years ago there was an accident with a Yak-40 on a flight from Baku: At that time the aircraft ran into serious turbulence and broke up on coming in from the mountains. But now one cannot blame the weather. Visibility was excellent, there was no turbulence, so it must have been something else. [passage omitted]

'Too Many' Aviation Incidents

PM181839 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jan 88 First Edition p 6

[Correspondent M. Volkov report: "Failed to 'Lock on' to Runway"]

[Text] Ashkhabad-Krasnovodsk—Early yesterday morning a passenger airliner (captained by Pilot First Class V. Churayev) on Flight 699 from Moscow to Krasnovodsk and Ashkhabad crashed on landing at Krasnovodsk city airport.

"The weather was fine, the atmosphere was clear and bright, and visibility was good: There was nothing to herald a tragedy," A. Myradov, second secretary of Krasnovodsk party obkom, told us. "Nevertheless the aircraft failed to 'lock on' to the runway, the undercarriage stuck in soft ground, and the aircraft overturned.

"The Turkmen Civil Aviation Administration airliner, with 127 passengers on board, broke in half; 4 people were killed on impact, 7 more were dead on arrival at the nearby hospital, and 12 were hospitalized. The other passengers were fortunately unhurt."

According to A. Myradov, the people have been given the necessary help in terms of accommodation, rest, food, and medical services. Those who needed it have been given a single, nonrepayable sum of money, and all have been granted priority status to continue their journey to Ashkhabad by whatever mode of transport they wish.

A republic government commission has been set up to investigate the circumstances of the airliner crash and give assistance to the victims and their families. It is headed by A. Khodzhamuradov, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers.

"It has to be said," Major General N. Kapustyan, chief of the republic civil defense staff, says, "that this is the second air transport accident in Turkmenia in the last 2 months (the first occurred on the Ashkhabad-Tashauz route, when an aircraft's undercarriage jammed). On that occasion everything ended happily, and no one was hurt. But aren't the airmen presenting their passengers with too many 'surprises'?"

Area Affected by Chernobyl 'Safe' for People

LD181355 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Minsk, 18 Jan (TASS)—Areas of Belorussia which were subjected to radioactivity following the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station are safe for the health of the people. Viktor Buryak, the republic's deputy health minister, stated this to a TASS correspondent.

The radiation situation in these areas is different from normal, he said. However, rumors about an increase in the sickness rate among the population in these places are groundless. There has been no change in the nature of illnesses here over the past 2 years and no unusual diseases have made their appearance. Following an analysis of tens of thousands of water and soil samples for radioactivity, specialists have satisfied themselves that initial pessimistic forecasts are groundless, the minister continued. A repeat 100% investigation of the population living in the territory closest to the evacuation was carried out in 1987. The state of peoples' health here turned out to be at the usual level, the same as everywhere in the republic. Today we have grounds to say that all serious consequences of the accident are in the past.

Railways Ministry Sets up Safety Directorate

LD161812 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 16 Jan 88

[From the IZVESTIYA Review]

[Text] The next article in the newspaper to which we want to draw your attention is devoted to the work of the transport sector. A decision has been taken to set up a Chief Directorate for Traffic Safety in the Ministry of Railways. The derailments at Kamenskaya, Koristovka, and Lyubotin forced a new look at the work of all the services of the railways ministry. Today the newspaper publishes an interview with the head of the new directorate, Solovyev, deputy minister of railways. He stresses that the main task of this directorate is to perceptibly raise the level of strictness and irreconcilability toward shortcomings. What is necessary is a reliable barrier against everything which can lead, in the end, to an accident. The rights of the inspectorate apparatus are being extended significantly. It is necessary to make full use of economic levers, little used in the past. An important task of the directorate is a deep analysis of traffic safety and also the creation and introduction of effective technical equipment.

Program Spotlights Drug Problem in Georgia

OW140801 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0410 GMT on 11 January 88 carries the scheduled "Restructuring Spotlight" program which deals with drug consumption in the Georgian SSR. The program is presented by correspondent Tamara Karetnikova.

Video begins by showing a woman detained at a militia station, with hypodermic syringes and other drug paraphernalia on a table. A narrator recounts that her son is serving a term for having used drugs, and that she is responsible for having led many people to their destruction.

Video cuts to show Karetnikova interviewing a drug pusher in a prison cell, who says that drugs are generally sold to young people and that there is no shortage of them. Subsequent shots show several retarded children of drug addicts. Karetnikova laments the fate of these children and goes on to say that drugs are imported into Georgia from Azerbaijan, Ukraine, and Krasnodar Kray, as video shows two militia posts on the Georgia-Azerbaijan border, militiamen inspecting vehicles, the interior of a mobile laboratory, and a young man detained for carrying marijuana while traveling in a bus from Kirovabad.

Video then shows Karetnikova interviewing D.P. Dzhamashiya, later identified by a screen caption as chief of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Department for Struggle Against Drug Addiction, who speaks about the work of his laboratory. He says that there have already been dozens of drug arrests in only 3 months. Video cuts to show an auditorium at the Georgian Polytechnical Institute, and then a drug treatment specialist talking to a student at a special drug control office of the institute. Dzhamashiya comments that at this institute "problems used to exist and there were registered drug addicts and drug users." He adds: "Now there is not a single registered drug addict. There are drug users, who are registered for preventive observation. We used to get rid of drug addicts. Now we work with them."

Answering Karetnikova's question about the drug problem on a wider scale, he says: "I think that primarily a unified system of combating drug addiction should be established, and that all departments and ministries concerned should be drawn into it. All efforts should be unified and pointed to one direction: the struggle against drug addiction."

Karetnikova tells about the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on amendments and supplements to the criminal law on drug addiction, which establishes standards for "smaller quantities" of drugs. She concludes the program by saying that all the various types of experience in the struggle against drug addiction should be made available to everyone.

Two-Candidate Election Seen Breaking New Ground

PM151647 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Correspondent N. Lisovenko report under the rubric "Voter. Deputy. Law": "For the First Time Two Candidates Have Been Placed on the Ballot Paper for the Election of a USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy"]

[Text] Last year Anatoliy Ivanovich Bezuglov, an ordinary working man, died. He was an instrument maker at the "Voroshilovgradteplovoz" production association and, in addition, a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities.

The next elections were still a long way off, so the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decreed that an election for a new deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities for Voroshilovgrad Electoral Okrug No 37 should be held on 10 January 1988.

Okrug No 37 is big. It includes six towns and eight rayons. It has over 1 million voters alone. If you consider that it was decided that Okrug No 37 should be the one where for the first time in years, or maybe in our entire history, not one, as has always been the case, but several candidates should be nominated for the supreme organ of state power and discussed, then the Voroshilovgrad election was bound to be a noteworthy event in the process of democratization. And it definitely was.

"People wanted to have an effective person on the Supreme Soviet, and so we in the city went through the candidacies of almost all more or less well known representatives of the working class," Antratsit Gorispolkom Chairman Vyacheslav Antonovich Salita said. "We settled on two: Viktor Fedorovich Zakharov and Anton Dmitriyevich Samoylov work at the mining repair plant which is now known as the chief enterprise of the 'Voroshilovgraduglеremont' association."

The collective of the mining repair plant spent a long time weighing the qualities of Zakharov and Samoylov. It was decided that the former was more suitable. Moreover he has experience of public activity—he is a member of the party gorkom and an acknowledged workers' leader.

Workers at the "Voroshilovgradteplovoz" association were equally painstaking in their approach to nominating a candidate deputy and eventually opted for Sergey Mikhaylovich Katilevskiy.

Following a comprehensive discussion of candidacies, in which nobody without any interest took part, on 23 December both Voroshilovgrad and Antratsit nominated workers: The diesel locomotive builders nominated smith Sergey Mikhaylovich Katilevskiy, a Communist, 34 years old, with secondary education, married with two sons, and a Russian, while the mining repair workers nominated machine operator Vitaliy Fedorovich Zakharov, a Communist, 43 years old, with secondary education, married with two daughters, and a Ukrainian.

A 25 December okrug pre-election conference of representatives of labor collectives from Voroshilovgradskiy Electoral Okrug No 37 for elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities unanimously decided to support the candidacies of V. Zakharov and S. Katilevskiy and asked them to agree to stand as candidate deputies.

The election took place 10 January.

"This was not the first time I had been fully involved in an election campaign," Yevgeniy Andreyevich Usenko, chief of the Voroshilovgrad Oblispolkomn Organizational Department, said, "but on this occasion the voters were much more active than ever before: People knew that who would become deputy depended on them."

By the morning of 11 January the results of the voting had been totaled. Some 608,381 voters had cast their vote for S.M. Katilevskiy and 412,028 for V.F. Zakharov.

A fairly appreciable difference.

"Our miner's support for V.F. Zakharov was obviously not enough," Aleksandr Romahin, a miner at the Krasnyy Luch mine named for the newspaper IZVESTIYA, said. "I personally voted for him, as did other voters in Krasnyy Luch, Rovenki, Sverdlovsk, and Antratsit."

Yet Voroshilovgrad and the rural rayons of the oblast voted solidly for S. Katilevskiy. There is a simple explanation: In the city, with its population of half a million, those who are connected with machine building predominate. But it is not all so simple when it comes to the rayons. Evidently one factor was the fact that "Voroshilovgradteplovoz" does a vast quantity of patronage work and that S.M. Katilevskiy paid more attention to rural problems in his election speeches than V.F. Zakharov did.

During the election and the election campaign I had some very interesting conversations which showed how civic awareness is growing and how the working people expect further democratization. The television appearance by the candidate deputies, the new form of the ballot paper with the two surnames of the candidate deputies, the first debates—all this is new, unaccustomed, and pleasing. That is what people said.

Unfortunately the Voroshilovgrad election was not an unreserved triumph for the new. Indeed, in fact it could not have been that, because after all, this is our first experiment, our first attempt to show civic maturity at every level: for the voters, the candidate deputies, the election organizers, and even our election legislation.

Yes, people were asked to choose one of two candidates. But let us see how they had to choose.

"You understand," V. Zakharov said, "we are both machine builders, both workers, and our election programs are virtually the same. Of course it is necessary to ensure the construction of a rural vocational and technical school in Krasnodonskiy Rayon, to help provide gas supplies to the settlements of Beloye and Belorechenskiy in Lutuginskiy Rayon, as well as the settlement of Biryukovo in Sverdlovskiy Rayon, and to finish doing what Anatoliy Ivanovich Bezuglov promised in his lifetime. However, when the meetings between candidates and voters took place, people did not only talk about these needs. They talked about how the schools are overfull in the new housing districts, and in some places in Antratsit, Krasnyy Luch, and also Voroshilovgrad the kids study in three shifts, how there are not enough kindergartens and clinics, how the region's water supplies are in a disastrous state, how the streetcar and bus services barely meet half the need."

What was the reaction to these important requests from the voters? Sometimes it was, so to speak, the same old reaction. For instance, Yu. Petrov, first secretary of Voroshilovgrad party gorkom, conducted a meeting with voters in the oblast center. When the speakers at the Railmen's Culture Institute mentioned 12 different requests, demands, and proposals, he stood up and said that only 3 could be adopted as official instructions, because, first, the fulfillment of such capital-intensive instructions as "improving water supplies" involves expenditure of many millions, second, the person elected will only serve just over a year as deputy until the routine Supreme Soviet elections in 1989, and, third, a session of the oblast soviet decides what instructions to adopt for execution in the given territory.

Undoubtedly much of what the party gorkom first secretary said was true. The term is short and millions of rubles are needed, but why, in the present case, were only three instructions specified? Because the regulated manner in which election campaigns were formerly conducted manifested itself once again.

So what did the election for Voroshilovgrad Okrug No 37 tell us? First and foremost, that there are no longer any indifferent voters in society, that people see Voroshilovgrad's experiment as the start of a reform [reformatsiya] of the electoral system at the highest level of sovereignty [derzhavnyy uroven].

Legislation Facing Supreme Soviet Outlined

LD152013 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—TASS news analyst Boris Prokhorov writes:

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has recently discussed a draft plan for the work of the Soviet Parliament for the new year.

Two parliamentary sessions will be held this year in accordance with the USSR Constitution and the established tradition. New laws of the USSR are to be adopted.

The legislative activity of the Supreme Soviet is based on the plan for 1986-1990. Many of its items have been fulfilled: The laws on the state enterprise, on the procedure of the discussion by the whole people of important matters of state life, on individual labour activity, on the procedure of complaining to court against illegal actions of officials and other laws have been adopted.

No less important legislation is to be considered. For instance, the USSR Supreme Soviet is to adopt a law on the quality of products, a law on discoveries and inventions. Their importance for the success of perestroyka can hardly be overestimated, in view of the fact of huge efforts that the whole country now exerts for the improvement of quality and technological standards of products.

Life, naturally, makes correctives to the plans of legislators. For instance, the cooperative movement developed widely in the USSR in the past 12-18 months. But complexities that interfere with the further growth of the network of cooperatives have come to light. It became clear that there is a need for a special law on cooperation. Such a law is being drafted now and will possibility be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet at one of the coming sessions.

At the end of the year the session of parliament will discuss, as usual, the draft plan and the draft budget of the country for the next year.

Moscow Residents Polled on Restructuring

LD181252 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—The changes taking place in the country are being approved by the majority of the Muscovites. This has been shown by the public opinion poll held by the Sociological Studies Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

Talking to journalists, Deputy Director of the institute, Dr. of Sc. (philosophy) Valeriy Mansurov commented on the results of the public opinion poll. 78 per cent of the respondents, he said, view perestroyka as the development of socialism, its consolidation, and only 5 per cent — as a departure from its principles. A big part of the respondents, 73 per cent, believe that the changes taking place in the USSR exert a favourable impact on the relations with Western countries.

Perestroyka has entailed many changes. One of them is that the cooperative movement has stepped up its activities. The attitude to it is different. 65 per cent of the Muscovites polled approve of it, while 17 per cent treat it negatively, and 17 per cent find it hard to give any answer at all. In the opinion of the scientist, there are opponents to the cooperatives since the people are still influenced by the old stereotype of thinking. For instance, there is the viewpoint that "all people working on cooperative lines are money-grabbers".

Cooperatives are now being formed in the USSR everywhere. In the past three months alone the number of people working on cooperative lines more than doubled. And still, cooperatives account for only 0.04 per cent of the total mass of the marketed commodities and services for the population in the country on the whole. Why is the share so small? It is a useful undertaking, and being new, it experiences the difficulties of growth: Not all was thought out and regulated well. Various bureaucratic obstacles also play a certain role. Recently the CPSU Central Committee passed the decision, demanding that state and economic agencies should remove in that sphere shortcomings and oversights, specifically manifestations of bureaucratism and formalism.

Leaders Attend Opening of Artists' Congress

LD190947 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Text] The USSR Artists' Congress opened today in Moscow at the Great Kremlin Palace. Delegates and guests met with applause Comrades Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Slyunkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Talyzin, Dobrynin, Lukyanov, Razumovskiy, and Kapitonov. Also present in the presidium are prominent leaders of fine arts, representatives of party, local soviets, public organizations, and working collectives. Leaders of the Artists' Union of the socialist countries are present.

On the congress' agenda are the review reports of the board of the USSR's Artists' Union and the Central Auditing Commission, and elections of the governing bodies of the Artists' Union.

Ponomarev, chairman of the board of the USSR Artists' Union, is presenting a review report.

Undercurrent of Dissent Noted

AU191031 Paris AFP in English 1011 GMT 19 Jan 88

[Pierre Glachant report]

[Text] Moscow, Jan 19 (AFP)—The Soviet Artists Union opened its first congress since 1983 here Tuesday in serious disarray due to internal dissent and the growing alienation of young painters.

The Union, which numbers some 20,000 artists, no longer enjoys the near-monopoly it used to have over Soviet artistic life.

For decades after its creation in the 1930s, it was practically impossible to set up an exhibition without the Union's sanction.

Such unofficial art exhibitions were quickly stifled by the authorities, notably in 1974 when bulldozers were used to break up a show at the Izmaylovo Park, east of the capital.

Critics and artists said the Union urgently needs a strong dose of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's "perestroyka" (restructuring) if it wants to continue to hold sway over artistic life.

The scale of disaffection of young artists from the official body was underlined by the fact that only 28 of the 851 delegates attending the congress, which ends on Friday, are aged under 35.

Of these, none hail from the artistic centers of Moscow and Leningrad.

A recent Soviet film, "If You Lie Once," deals with another little-known problem facing the Union: the effects of the exodus of Soviet artists to Paris and New York in the 1970s.

The number of art exhibition sites has also grown, making it far more difficult for the Union to effectively control artistic expression.

Muscovites now frequently spend their weekends admiring new works at the Izmaylovo Park, while many young artists exhibit their works in central Moscow's Arbat Street pedestrian precinct.

Self-styled "avant garde" painters set up exhibitions in unusual places, such as on river boats on the Moscova last week, or at Moscow's Sandunovskiy public baths.

Although there is general agreement over the extent of the crisis within the Union, few agree on the steps needed to find a solution or the ways to cope with the upsurge in "free artists."

The Union's president, Nikolay Ponomarev, is to submit a report on the body's activities during the congress.

Some Union leaders, such as Igor Obrosov favor independent exhibitions, saying that they offer large numbers of Soviets the possibility of discovering new trends in art.

Others however have expressed concern over the artistic quality of the exhibitions and the wheeling and dealing that takes place there.

Another Union leader, Oleg Savostyuk, was quoted by the government daily IZVESTIYA as saying that the Arbat Street art shows were "a new phenomenon in our artistic life."

He added that such shows could hardly be considered as a "paradise of the arts."

Mr. Savostyuk stressed that the Artists Union was at the crossroads, torn between a willingness to open up artistic expression and the desire to withdraw into its ivory tower.

Material problems also plague the Union, and Mr. Savostyuk told IZVESTIYA that the Soviet Union lacked art exhibition sites and even "quality paint brushes and paints."

The Union's congress, its seventh, is therefore expected to be of major importance for the body's future.

The official news agency TASS said Tuesday that President Andrey Gromyko and Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzkhov would be attending the congress.

Professor Explains Foreign Books' Censorship

PM181415 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Jan 88 Single Edition p 5

[Article by Professor Ya. Zasurskiy, doctor of philological sciences, under the "Ongoing Discussion" rubric: "Yes, We Do Make Cuts in Foreign Books. But Why?"]

[Text] "I have read the article entitled 'The Cut Chapter' with its commentary by Professor Ya. Zasurskiy. I would like to express certain ideas of my own to you. First, it is not clear whether the novel "A Clockwork Orange" has been published in the Soviet Union. If the answer is yes, in what numbers? If no, then, forgive me, but how much longer are our mass media going to go on telling us about works which we have not read, films that have not been released here, and so on?

"Second, 'There's no point blaming the mirror if you've got an ugly face,' as the saying goes. You know perfectly well, as does Comrade Zasurskiy, that even the classics of modern world literature are published with cuts in our country..."

I would like to start the discussion of the readers' postbag produced by the article "The Cut Chapter" (18 Jul 87) by citing these lines taken from the letter sent by Muscovite Yu. Krestnikov. In the article-cum-confession in question the well-known English writer Anthony Burgess talks, many years after his novel "A Clockwork Orange" came out in the United States, about how he was obliged to agree to the publication of his work without the final, in his view, humanistic chapter. As a result a dehumanized work was published that, in Burgess' opinion, was part of the publishers' plans. As it was far from sharing all the writer's views, the editorial office asked me at the time to comment on the article.

I quoted Yu. Krestikov's opinion at the beginning deliberately, as it is in line with statements and ideas to be found in certain other letters. To answer it I will give a few facts. The following figure were quoted at a meeting between representatives of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade and USIA Director Charles Wick. For every one work of Soviet or Russian literature published in the United States there are 100 U.S. works published in the USSR. The ratio is little different regarding the other developed capitalist countries. The conclusion is obvious: The reproach that we pay insufficient attention to foreign literature is unfounded.

As far as "A Clockwork Orange" is concerned, Burgess himself acknowledges in the article that the novel is a drastic mixture of pathological sex and violence. As is well-known, the propagating of violence, war, and pornography is forbidden by law in our country. The question arises why when banning, and quite rightly, their dissemination in our country we should admit all this from the outside. We should not and cannot!

What, then, was the point of such an article (which, incidentally, was in no way a review)? Having agreed to the publication of the novel without the sole, in the author's opinion, life-enhancing chapter, Burgess acknowledges that it has not helped humanize youth in the United States. This is even more true of Stanley Kubrick's screen version of the novel. That means the publication of the novel (which is, incidentally, not of the highest standard) went far beyond the bounds of the narrowly literary and became an event of a social order.

Why then in such a case were we not entitled to publish the article, in which the author repents for having helped make available a dehumanized work to a wide public by caving in to the pressure of commercial censorship, particularly as this confession reveals the true state of the writer in a "free society" and the measure of his responsibility?

The second reproach made by Yu. Krestnikov is that we publish some works with cuts. That is indeed so. It is sometimes very annoying to have to act in such a way. But there are a number of factors that should not be forgotten. First, the ratio itself that Wick cited. Second, there is the paper factor: The publishers' production capacities (and this is a constant topic in the press) are not sufficient even to publish our own literature. In addition, one needs to consider the fact that since the signing of the copyright convention we simply have no right to abridge works without prior negotiation with the author. By the way, quite often authors will meet us halfway when our objections concern excessive naturalism in the portrayal of violence or, say, pornography. William Styron, for example, readily agreed to the proposed cuts when the publication of his novel "Sophie's Choice" in the magazine INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA came up recently.

However, there is also another undeniable fact. During the period of stagnation it often happened that passages were cut according to the safety-first principle and sometimes the bureaucratic approach triumphed. Facts of this kind should be condemned and we must hope that they will not be repeated.

As for abridgments, we must not forget the widely-developed Western institution of "digests." These are periodicals which offer the most sensational modern works in condensed form. Incidentally, by comparison with these extracts the versions in our journals may be equated with full-blooded works.

I have another comment on the moral aspect. It is the United States which is most often the source of criticism about a lack of freedom of speech in our country. But what are the facts of the matter? We publish foreign authors in large editions, even if we do sometimes abridge them. But we do publish them! In the United States they simply are not printed. That applies not only to Soviet literature but also to books from other countries. In 1985 I attended a cultural forum in Budapest. One of the speakers there was the Austrian writer B. Frischmuth who said among other things that the works of Austrian authors are published and read in the USSR, Bulgaria, Poland, and Hungary but are rarely printed in France, hardly at all in Britain, and not at all in the United States.

I shall permit mayself one more quotationfrom a reader's letter—a reader called Nazarov, who, by the way, is unwilling to give his address: "You write about Burgess. But what about our own literature? We do not know the works of Karamzin. We are afraid of Bunin and Pilnyak. We are not pleased Bulgakov has been saved from oblivion or that Nabokov's bright star has begun to shine on the horizon of Russian literature. You don't need me to tell you about all the anomalies in our cultural life. But there is no point in burdening our consciences with information which is not to our advantage. It is far more convenient to opt for your position—that of criticizing the other side and of failing to see what is going on right in front of us..."

What do you mean, right in front of us? On my bookshelves I can see a multivolume edition of Bunin and a book by B. Pilnyak, published 7 years ago. I believe a six-volume collection of Bulgakov's works is being prepared for publication. Several journals have carried controversial but interesting articles and works by Nabokov. Not to mention a whole series of talented works by modern Soviet writers.

There is scarcely a single publication which has not featured articles dealing with the problem of how during the period of stagnation talented books and movies were left on the shelves. It seems that Comrade Nazarov has not been keeping up with the periodicals or that, if he has, his claims are strange, to say the least. You get the impression that he simply believes everything happening in our country should be regarded as unreservedly negative. His approach is fundamentally wrong and harmful. It is one matter if we merely berated everything foreign without seeing our own shortcomings but now, when no themes are off limits in the discussion of questions of cultural development, is it not the time to talk about the shortcomings—be they unintentional or ideologically motivated—of the purely commercial approach to publishing?.

Reader Letters Support 'Remembrance' Holiday

PM131521 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 88 Second Edition p 2

[Colonel V. Izgarshev article: "Readers' Response. Concerning Memorial Day"]

[Text] The editorial board has received 1,140 letters: 1,083 "for" and 57 "against."

"Bequeathed To Descendants"—this was the title of a report by Moscow writer Aleksandr Kiknadze published in PRAVDA 21 April 1986. It put forward a proposal regarding the institution of a Remembrance Day for Relatives and Friends.

"Before writing these notes, I talked with service chiefs and soldiers—veterans of the Great Patriotic War, historians, cosmonauts, party workers, and those who lost their parents at an early age," the author recalled. "I asked: Do they not think that the time has come to introduce into our life and our all-union calendar a Remembrance Day? I heard just a single word in reply: 'Yes!'"

"It is our duty to those of whom it was said of old: May they live for ever in people's memory."

The readers of PRAVDA responded ardently to this proposal. The editorial office received 1,140 letters. Some of them carried dozens, even hundreds of signatures from PRAVDA subscribers. A. Konovalov, former border guard, veteran of the Great Patriotic War, and teacher at Moscow University, brought the editorial office a thick book containing 2,000 (!) signatures collected in Moscow, the Urals, and the Caucasus. Thus the number of votes "for" exceeds the number of letters several times.

In Georgia, which introduced a Remembrance Day for Relatives and Friends into the national calendar in 1983, a television program was devoted to the "Bequeathed to Descendants" report and a number of newspapers reprinted material from PRAVDA.

After this we published reports, surveys, and letters from readers proposing when and how to mark the significant date ("Memory Is With You," 26 August 1986; "Sizov 27th...," 8 October 1986; "I Support You Wholeheartedly...," 3 March 1987).

What has analysis of the editorial mailbag shown? A total of 43% of readers incline toward instituting the memorial date on one of the first 10 days of May. May 2 is called for particularly often: "The capture of Berlin, traditionally a nonworking day, spring." Certain readers recommend renaming 9 May Victory and Remembrance Day, justifying this by the established custom of paying homage to the dead at the hour of victory dear to us all.

A total of 41% of readers named 22 June in their response: "A day of grief when the tragic count of the millions of victims of the Great Patriotic War began." This group of letters proposes to make 22 June a nonworking day—at the expense of 2 May. Eleven percent of readers named other dates. Five percent did not support the proposal: "We already have 9 May as a day when we honor the dead nationwide..."

Most of the authors of the comments agreed on one thing: We have no right to forget those who fought selflessly on the fronts of the Civil War, those who fell in Spain and on the territory of Afghanistan, those who defended the country with might and main in the years of the fascist invasion, and those patriots of the fatherland whose lives were cut short through their incredibly hard work in the years of intensive peaceful building and those who fell victim to unwarranted repressions while remaining faithful to Communist ideals in their hearts.

Readers have put forward many different and sometimes unexpected proposals as to how to mark Remembrance Day. Published reviews of letters have indicated the most noteworthy of them.

The idea is gaining more and more new supporters. This is also illustrated by the proposal which the Soviet Cultural Foundation Board Presidium addressed to the public (IZVESTIYA, 4 December 1987). The appeal said: Let Remembrance Day be a tribute to all those who have died for the progressive convictions which nurtured the mighty tree of the socialist fatherland and are germinating today in our contemporaries' hearts. Let everyone to whom we owe our very existence, who has asserted his originality, his ideals, and the right to build a socially just society be remembered...

A glorious custom stemming from the depths of time and the bottom of our hearts is knocking persistently at the door of our life, now animated by beneficial changes.

The living have a sacred responsibility to the dead, and they have a high responsibility to future generations.

Briefs

New Ethnic Newspapers

Moscow 12 Jan (TASS)—In the first few days of the new year readers in Latvia in the Baltic received the first edition of the SELSKAYA GAZETA in Lettish. The paper has started up here with a print run of 65,000 copies. In Georgia in Transcaucasia the first edition of the newspaper NARODNOYE OBRAZOVANIYE, targeted at teachers, has appeared in Georgian. And 22,000 copies of the first edition of a new weekly GORIZONT for young students have been printed in Kazakhstan in both Kazakh and Russian. In the conditions of glasnost, there is a growing interest in periodicals in the USSR. The print run of the country's newspapers has increased in 1988 by 19 million copies. [Text] [*Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0759 GMT 12 Jan 88 LD*]

Economic

New Foreign Trade Bank Begins Activities

LD181550 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—A new Soviet bank for foreign economic activities, the successor of the Bank for Foreign Trade of the USSR, has been in business since January 1 and its board chairman told TASS that its founding has been due to the policy of streamlining economic machinery and developing foreign economic relations more intensively.

Yuriy Moskovskiy added that the bank's prime mission is to provide banking services for the system of economic relations with foreign countries.

The account-settling and crediting services for export and import transactions by ministries, factories and associations, including joint and international ventures, will be offered by the bank with the participation of specialized banking institutions of the USSR.

This will be a new role for the bank acting as an organizer of work to update the system of account-settling and crediting for the country's foreign economic relations.

The new bank, Moskovskiy said, has been founded on a solid basis. Its predecessor, the bank for Foreign Trade, is widely known in international financial and banking circles and enjoys a high business reputation. By the beginning of 1987, its balance sheet for own operations totalled 64.8 billion roubles, while annual profits exceeded one billion roubles, including 730 million roubles in foreign currency.

The Bank for Foreign Economic Activities of the USSR offers banking service packages to both Soviet organizations and their foreign partners. Besides, it will be directly involved in new forms of foreign economic relations.

At the same time, the bank, just like any other commercial bank in the world, Moskovskiy said, is active in the international currency market, including the securities market. In the beginning of the year, for example, it successfully issued bonds in Switzerland. Such operations are standard banking practice. The success of that venture reflected the high standing of the bank and the economic strength of the Soviet Union.

The funds obtained through the undertaking will be used to develop mutually advantageous East-West economic cooperation.

The bank's international relations are based on correspondence with nearly 2,000 foreign banking institutions, including some 500 major banks of the world.

The bulk of international transactions are with the financial establishments of socialist countries, with which cooperation is maintained either on a bilateral basis or through the international bank for economic cooperation and the international investment bank.

Along with traditional forms of business contacts with Western banks, the new Soviet bank has been successfully pursuing such a new form of relations with them as the forming of joint working groups to study the financial aspects of joint ventures.

Moskovskiy said that the Bank for Foreign Economic Activities of the USSR is prepared to discuss proposals whose realization will make a positive contribution to activating the system of the country's foreign economic relations and help develop international economic cooperation.

Foreign Investment Protection Analyzed

LD181342 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 18 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS—Over 20 joint enterprises attracting foreign capital have by now been formed on the territory of the USSR, and a number of projects are about to be signed. This was reported to journalists by Ivan Ivanov, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Joint ventures entail the question of an official investment protection system. A number of guarantees are given by the Law on Joint Enterprises. According to its provisions, the foreign firm's property in the USSR is protected in the same status as the property of the Soviet State. It cannot be confiscated or expropriated administratively and it can be penalized only by the court.

Besides, said Ivan Ivanov, the USSR is ready to conclude with interested states inter-governmental[1] agreements on mutual protection of capital investments. The approximate content of such documents, elaborated by Soviet lawyers following consultation with foreign colleagues, has been endorsed. It is stipulated that the action of the agreements will spread, as a rule, to the territory of the USSR and partner-countries, and also their economic sea zone and the continental shelf.

The standard model of such agreements provides for each of the contracting sides to mutually ensure the most favoured nation treatment of the partner's investors. It is stipulated that the sides shall not resort on a mutual basis to forced withdrawal of capital investments, and in case nationalisation is necessary, investors shall get fast and fair compensation and the right to remit it abroad. Remittance abroad of incomes from foreign capital investments, also in the form of profits, dividends, interest rate, licence payments, commission money, payment for services and also sums of money to pay off loans and part of the wages of foreign personnel of joint enterprises is to be regulated.

Also stipulated is the procedure of settlement of disputes which should be resolved through negotiations—but if these fails, by the court of arbitration to consist of three arbiters, either side appoints an arbiter and the third one is invited by them jointly. The decisions of the courts of arbitration are final.

The agreements on mutual protection of investments are to be ratified by both sides. Their provisions shall be applied to all capital investments made after the signing of the documents, and, should the sides desire, to the money invested earlier than that date. The approximate term of agreements is 15 years. From the Soviet side negotiations on concluding agreements are to be conducted by the Finance Ministry, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations of the USSR.

Agricultural

Ligachev on Preparation for Spring Harvest

PM181337 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Ensure Exemplary Preparation for Spring Field and Harvesting Work"]

[Text] At the CPSU Central Committee 16 January leaders of union ministries and departments took part in an examination of questions of ensuring the prompt and high-quality preparation of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises in the agro-industrial complex for the well-organized execution of the whole range of spring field work. There was an examination of the situation in sectors which had failed to meet contractual commitments for the supply to the countryside of equipment, fertilizers, plant-protection agents, spares, and other resources.

It was noted that the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry, and other departments have been slow to make up their backlog in the sale to kolkhozes and sovkhozes of tractors, soil-preparation, sowing, and harvesting equipment, spares, and repair materials. Certain enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Production of Mineral Fertilizers and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry have a large shortfall in supplies of fertilizers and chemical plant-protection agents.

A considerable number of farms, above all in the Non-Chernozem Zone, the Urals, Siberia, and Kazakhstan, have failed to secure their own seed supply. The improvement in the sowing standards of seeds, however, is inexcusably slow; leaders and specialists have reconciled themselves to this fact, and effective measures to rectify the prevailing situation are not being taken. Party committees are not showing due exactingness on this matter. The USSR Ministry of Grain Products is slow to prepare high-quality seeds and, together with the USSR Ministry of Railways, has not organized the trannsshipment of seeds within and between regions, as the interests of the cause demand. The USSR Gosagroprom and its local organs must pay considerably greater attention to the organization of the whole range of work, particularly to the preparation of seeds, equipment, and cadre training in intensive techniques.

A.A. Yezhevskiy, USSR minister of tractor and agricultural machine building, V.P. Morozov, USSR first deputy minister of the automotive industry, S.I. Maniyakin, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, A.D. Budyka, USSR minister of grain products, S.V. Kolpakov, USSR minister of ferrous metallurgy, and Ye.I. Sizenko, USSR Gosagroprom first deputy chairman, delivered reports to the conference on the measures being taken to eliminate the shortcomings noted.

The conference was addressed by Ye.K. Ligachev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary. This year, he said, an important new step must be taken toward resolving the food question. As is well-known, the party is paying unremitting attention to this problem, and its solution determines to a large extent the depth and effectiveness of the changes taking place in the country. Everything must be done to ensure that the country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes and agrarian sector workers carry out field work in the 3d year of the 5-year plan within the optimum deadline and to a high quality and lay the basis for the future harvest. Only then can we expect our food base to strengthen. It is only with this approach that we can really count on success in implementing the economic reform in the agro-industrial complex and on increasing the effectiveness of economic accountability and the contract. The transfer of labor collectives in machine building, the chemical industry, and other sectors to self-financing does not reduce the responsibility for providing the countryside with the planned material and technical resources, Ye.K. Ligachev stressed, it increases it still further.

The attention of local party, soviet, and economic organs was drawn to the need to promptly investigate enterprises which have caused disruptions to the production of agricultural equipment and spares and take urgent measures to make good the backlog created. Everyone—machine builders, metalworkers, chemical workers, and rural machine operators—should evaluate their results in light of the need to fully complete the repair of equipment for spring field work by February and the existing harvest machine pool by April.

The solution of this important economic and political task requires a comprehensive intensification of party committees' organizational work and attention to work collectives and the creation of the appropriate consumer service and production conditions in all areas of production to ensure their highly productive labor.

The work of central ministries and departments and local party and economic organs in ensuring that kolkhozes and sovkhozes receive a steady supply of spares and repair materials and that the quality of the equipment and other resources supplied to the countryside improves should constantly be in the purview of people's control organs and the mass media.

Media Report 9-15 Jan Agricultural Developments

LD160055 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricutural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 9-15 January. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

9 January

No fileworthy items monitored.

10 January

All sowing and soil cultivating equipment in Krasnodar Kray is ready for spring work in the fields. Repair work on other kinds of agricultural hardware is proceeding ahead of schedule. (0700)

11-14 January

No fileworthy items monitored.

15 January

In the past 5-Year plan alone land improvement workers in Armenia have brought under cultivation 30,000 hectares of stony virgin lands, using irrigation. (0230)

Scientific

Six 'Cosmos' Satellites Launched 15 Jan

LD151301 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—The Soviet Union today orbited six satellites with a single rocket.

The satellites, Cosmos-1909, Cosmos-1910, Cosmos-1911, Cosmos-1912, Cosmos-1913 and Cosmos-1914, carry scientific equipment for continuing space exploration.

All the six are moving along close to designated orbits with the following initial parameters:

period of revolution—113.8 minutes,

maximum distance from earth—1,433 kilometers.

minimum distance—1,386 kilometers,

inclination—82.6 degrees.

The equipment on board the satellites is functioning normally.

Work on Board 'Mir' Space Station

LD151327 Moscow World Service in English 1031 GMT 14 Jan 88

[Excerpts] Our first item today is about the new crew aboard the Mir orbital station. [passage omitted] Our science correspondent, Boris Belitskiy, will now tell us about some of the work the new crew are doing, but first I've asked him to remind us of the main characteristic of the Mir station:

[Belitskiy] [Passage omitted] As Viktor Blagov, the deputy flight director, put it: We have become a continuously operating pilot plant. Indeed, in the past, while the station was operating in the unmanned mode it was possible in between missions to give most of the ground specialists vacations and to carry out maintenance work at the flight control center. Most important of all their time was used for drawing up the program for the next mission. Now, all this has to be done while work in space is in progress. It might seem at first glance that drawing up such a timetable of work with the aid of a computer is a simple task. Not quite. The research program of the previous crew listed over 1,000 sessions of work on 70 different research projects, each with its own features.

For example, during the materials processing experiments, the crew cannot exercise on the treadmill since the vibrations this causes could distort the experimental results. Similarly, some of the visual observations of the earth become impossible if the surface is covered with cloud. This in turn calls for long-term weather forecasts and so on. Or, again, as soon as X-ray radiation had been registered coming from the recently discovered supernova the crew had to be given additional time for observations on the "Kvant" astro-physical module. And while on the subject about supernova, let me add a few words about the work of the mission control center.

It's very seldom that astronomers have the chance to observe such astro-physical objects as a supernova. The previous supernova, which was visible with the naked eye, flared up in the year 1604. So you can understand how eagerly scientists in many countries awaited, and await, information from the instruments aboard the "Kvant" module.

But, as luck would have it, this supernova is close to a well-known and rather powerful source of X-rays and this considerably interfered with the observations. On the firmament they were a mere half degree apart. But the crew soon learned to spin the space complex with such filigree accuracy that the interfering source would be out of the field of view of the instrument while the supernova remained in it.

The crew are also continuing the materials processing work. In fact they've now begun a new series of experiments, with their "Korund" installations. This time the aim is to prepare extra-pure metal alloys. In short, the peaceful scientific and technical research aboard the Mir complex continues in full gear and Titov and Manarov have a long flight ahead of them.

Cosmonauts Continue Experiments

LD151158 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 15 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—TASS correspondent reports from the mission control centre:

The Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov continue to fulfil a program of experiments on board the Mir orbital complex.

During the past several days the crew devoted much time to the study of astrophysical objects in various wave ranges. On January 13 through 14 they surveyed separate areas of the Orion and Puppis constellations with the help of the Glazar ultraviolet telescope, while telescopes of the Roentgen orbital observatory were aimed at a Roentgen pulsar in the Hercules constellation.

The cosmonauts conducted several experiments for a further mastering of methods of applying electroplating coatings in conditions of weightlessness within the framework of a program of space material studies.

Out-of-the-atmosphere astronomic studies with the help of scientific equipment of the Kvant module will be continued today. Specifically, it is planned to survey the Carina and Columba constellations with the help of the Glazar telescope.

Apart from it, the schedule for today envisages maintenance work at the space complex and physical exercises.

According to telemetric data and reports of the crew, the flight of the Mir research complex is going on in a normal way.

The cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are in good health and feel well.